The Game of Tarot

from Ferrara to Salt Lake City

Michael Dummett

with the assistance of Sylvia Mann

CHAPTER 20

The Order of the Tarot Trumps

Those who, in the eighteenth century, when the Italian suit-signs of the traditional Tarot pack were replaced by French ones, also substituted animal figures for the traditional trump subjects, and those who later replaced these with rural scenes, views of buildings or characters from the drama, obviously did not think they were depriving the pack of any essential feature. What was essential to a trump card was its position in the sequence, indicated by its number; for the rest, antiquated mediaeval figures were being replaced by subjects more to modern taste. Many people, however, have been fascinated by the figures on the trump cards of the Latin-suited Tarot pack, and have sought to uncover a hidden symbolism lost to us. They have been convinced that these figures must have a deeper meaning than appears on the surface; and, in particular, they have believed that there is a significance, not only in the individual cards, but in the precise order in which they are arranged. Foremost among these have, of course, been the occultists; but, as we saw in Chapter 6, their interpretations have been completely arbitrary, or based on false premisses such as the ancient Egyptian or Hebrew origin of the cards. In so far as the occultist interpretation has rested on anything more than whim or demonstrably spurious history, it has been based on the details of the trumps in the Tarot de Marseille pattern. If we are seeking the symbolic intentions of those who first designed the Tarot pack, the Tarot de Marseille is a dubious guide. We cannot feel sure that the pattern is, as a whole, any older than the seventeenth century; and, although the order of the trumps which it observes goes back at least to Catelin Geoffroy's pack of 1557, we do not know it to have any exact Italian prototype. Speculations based on false data are obviously worthless.

Not all of those who have sought to decode the symbolism of the Tarot pack have been occultists; some have been serious scholars, well versed in the iconography of late mediaeval and early Renaissance art. One W.M. Seabury wrote a book to prove that the symbolism of the pack was based upon Dante;[1] Miss Gertrude Moakley, in her fine book about the Visconti-Sforza pack, advanced an interpretation of the pack, supported by much evidence from Italian art and literature; Mr Ronald Decker has engaged in complicated speculations, linking the pack to the astrology of the time. I am not going to advance another such theory. I do not even want to take a stand about the theories that have been advanced. The question is whether a theory is needed at all. I do not mean to deny that some of the subjects, or some of the details of their conventional representation, may have had a symbolic significance obvious to fifteenth-century Italians, or, at least, to educated ones, that escapes us and may be revealed by patient research; that is very likely to be the case. But the question is whether the sequence as a sequence has any special symbolic meaning. I am inclined to think that it did not: to think, that is, that those who originally designed the Tarot pack were doing the equivalent, for their day, of those who later selected a sequence of animal pictures to adorn the trump cards of the new French-

[1] William Marston Seabury, *The Tarot Cards and Dante's Divine Comedy*, New York, 1951.

suited pack. They wanted to design a new kind of pack with an additional set of twenty-one picture cards that would play a special, indeed a quite new, role in the game; so they selected for those cards a number of subjects, most of them entirely familiar, that would naturally come to the mind of someone at a fifteenth-century Italian court. It is rather a random selection: we might have expected all seven principal virtues, rather than just the three we find – and, of course, we do find all seven in the Minchiate pack, and they were probably present also in the Visconti di Modrone pack. With the Sun and Moon we might have expected the other five planets, instead of just a star; with the Pope and the Emperor, we might have expected other ranks and degrees. But, of course, in a pack of cards what is essential is that each card may be instantly identified; so one does not want a large number of rather similar figures, especially before it occurred to anyone to put numerals on the trump cards for ease of identification. Certainly most of the subjects on the Tarot trumps are completely standard ones in mediaeval and Renaissance art; there seems no need of any special hypothesis to explain them. Whatever may be the truth about those who first designed the Tarot pack, the inventors of the Minchiate pack surely approached their task in the spirit I have suggested: they wanted twenty additional subjects, and they chose ones which it was natural for men of the sixteenth century to think of – the four elements, the remaining virtues, the signs of the Zodiac – and inserted them *en bloc* in a convenient place. I do not think that anyone has suggested that there is any hidden significance in the sequence of Minchiate trumps.

That is my opinion; but I do not want to insist on it. It may be that those who first devised the Tarot pack had a special purpose in mind in selecting those particular subjects and in arranging them in the order that they did: perhaps they then spelled out, to those capable of reading them, some satirical or symbolic message. If so, it is apparent that, at least by the sixteenth century, the capacity to read this message had been lost. There are many references to *tarocchi* in sixteenth-century Italian literature, in which their symbolic potentialities were exploited, but always in an obvious way: no hint survives that any more arcane meaning was associated with them. 'What else', asks Flavio Alberto Lollio in his

Invettiva contra il Giuoco del Taroco, 'do they signify, the Popess, the Chariot, the Traitor, the Wheel, the Hunchback, Fortitude, the Star, the Moon, Death, Hell and all the rest of this revolving bizarrerie, save that this man [the inventor of the game] had an empty head, full of smoke, caprices and idle tales?' Lollio, of course, had no interest in making much sense of the Tarot trumps; but he could hardly have written in quite this vein if there was generally acknowledged to be some particular interpretation to be placed on them.

The search for a hidden meaning may be a unicorn hunt; but, if there is a hidden meaning to be found, only a correct basis of fact will lead us to it. The hidden meaning, if any, lies in the sequential arrangement of the trump cards; and therefore, if it is to be uncovered, we must know what, originally, that arrangement was. In all Italian-suited packs made outside Italy since 1700, the order is always and everywhere the same, namely that found in the Tarot de Marseille. There is, as we have seen, some variation in the subjects: the Pope and Popess are replaced, in the Tarot de Besançon, by Jupiter and Juno, and, in the Belgian Tarot, as in de Hautot's pack, by Bacchus and the Spanish Captain. But, from the beginning of the eighteenth century, the order of the trump subjects and their numbering remain constant, in the Belgian Tarot as well as in the Tarot de Marseille and its various offshoots. In the seventeenth century, we have Viévil's pack with a significantly different order: we also have, in de Hautot's pack and the list given in the *Maison académique*, the minor variation in which the Empress was higher than the Emperor. But we also find the exact Tarot de Marseille order in the anonymous seventeenth-century Parisian pack; and, as remarked, we also find it in Geoffroy's pack of 1557, so that it is plainly of considerable antiquity in France. The use of just the same order in all other countries of Europe, other than Italy, simply reflects the fact that it was to France and other French-speaking regions, including those in Switzerland, that the game of Tarot first spread from Italy, and from which it spread further to yet other lands. Since the eighteenth century, the Tarot de Marseille order has been well known in Italy itself, being observed in the Lombard pattern and in the Tarocco Piemontese which remains in wide use to this day, both patterns being descendants of the Tarot de Marseille. It will, however, already have been apparent to the reader, from what we

have seen of the Tarocco Bolognese, the Tarocco Siciliano and the Minchiate packs, that the Tarot de Marseille order was not and is not the only order for the trump cards known in Italy. In fact, there is no clear evidence that the Tarot de Marseille order was ever known in Italy before the appearance of the Lombard and Piedmontese variants of the Tarot de Marseille in the eighteenth century. There is, however, no one trump order which we could set over against that of the Tarot de Marseille as being the predominant Italian one; rather, the evidence yields a number of distinct orders used in different places or by different players.

There are three types of source that we have for the different orderings of the trumps observed by Italian card players. First, there are the three variant types of pack, the Tarocco Bolognese, the Tarocco Siciliano and the Minchiate pack. The Minchiate pack has, of course, twenty additional trumps: but since these were inserted *en bloc* at a certain point in the sequence of standard trump subjects, we can remove them and study the resulting order in reasonable confidence that it represents an order observed for the trumps of the 78-card pack at the time the Minchiate pack was invented. Secondly, there are the early packs that survive to us. Not all of these are any help, since we noted that the trumps in the fifteenth-century hand-painted packs lack numerals, and we therefore cannot tell how they were ordered; but we have a few packs, mostly popular ones printed from wood blocks, in which the trumps bear numerals. Finally, there are literary sources. The earliest of these is the sermon against gaming in the anonymous volume of sermons once owned by Robert Steele; it is dated between 1450 and 1480, probably towards the end of that period, and gives a list of all the trumps with their numbers. A well-known list, without numbers, is given by Tomaso Garzoni (1549-1589) in his *La Piazza Universale* (Venice, 1585). Garzoni uses a phrase which has been understood to mean that he has taken the list from an earlier writer, Raffaele Maffei Volterrano (1455-1522), but no such list is known to occur in Volterrano's writings; Garzoni's remark may not be so intended.[2] The

[2] Tomaso Garzoni, *La Piazza Universale di Tutte le Professioni del Mondo, e nobili et ignobili*, Venice, 1585. The list occurs in the chapter 'de' Giocatori in universale, et in particolare', which is Discourse 69 of the later editions, and is to be found on p. 574 of the Venice, 1586 edition.

remaining two sources known to me are examples of a curious form of verse fashionable in

---

Garzoni's turn of phrase is curious: he says, 'Alcuni altri son giuochi da tauerne, come la mora, le piastrelle, le chiaui, e le carti, ò communi, ò Tarocchi, di nuoua inuentione, secondo il Volteranno: oue si vedono danari, coppe, spade, bastoni, dieci, noue, ...', and continues by listing the remaining twelve cards of each suit, followed by the trumps in descending order and finally the Matto; after a mention of the French suits (as used 'con le carte fine'), he lists a number of card games, beginning with Tarocchi and Primiera. (In English, the quoted passage runs, 'Some others are tavern games, such as *mora*, quoits, keys and cards, either ordinary ones, or tarocchi, recently invented according to Volterrano: in which are to be seen Coins, Cups, Swords, Batons, the 10, the 9, ...'. Mora is a well-known game in which each of two players simultaneously holds up a hand, with five, two or no fingers extended; I do not know what 'keys' are.) For some reason, Garzoni's reference to *tarocchi* is much the best known of the sixteenth-century ones, and is cited by a whole string of later writers, including Senftleben (Andreas Senftlebius, *De alvea veterum opusculum posthumum*, Leipzig, 1667), who mistranslates *Fortezza* as *propugnaculum* (fortress), and the notes to Saverio Bettinelli's *Il giuoco delle carte, poemetto* (Cremona, 1775); many of these attribute the list to Volterrano. Garzoni's phrase 'secondo il Volteranno' appears, however, to relate, not to the list of trumps, but to the apparent observation that *tarocchi* are a recent invention. Even on this interpretation, the remark is baffling, since Tarot cards are nowhere referred to in the *Commentariorum Urbanorum XXXVIII libri* of Raffaele Maffei, called Volterrano after his place of birth, which were first published in Rome in 1506, nor, so far as anyone has discovered, in any other of his writings, as was observed by Robert Steele in 1900; moreover, the Tarot pack had existed for a hundred and fifty years when Garzoni was writing, and for at least fifteen when Maffei was born. The explanation appears to be that Garzoni meant that playing cards in general were a recent invention, and that he was alluding to the remark by Maffei that 'Chartarum vero & sortium & divinationis ludi priscis additi sunt ab avaris ac perditis inventi' ('To the ancient games have been added those of cards and of lots and of divination, invented by covetous and dissolute men'). This remark occurs in the section 'De ludo diverso quo summi viri quandoque occupati fuerunt' of book **XXIX** of the *Commentaria Urbana* (p. 421 verso of the Rome, 1506, edition, p. 313 verso of the Paris, 1511, edition, and p. 694 of the Basle, 1559, edition; the second ampersand, present in the 1506 and 1511 editions, is missing from that of 1559). Maffei is meaning to convey by this observation no more than that the games he is referring to were not played in classical times. Garzoni was not, therefore, quoting him in support of any thesis that *tarocchi* were of *recent* invention, only as saying that playing cards are of modern, as opposed to ancient, origin. (I am uncertain to what Maffei was referring as *sortium & divinationis ludi*, but I do not think the passage can be treated as evidence that cards were used for fortune-telling; we have in all *three* modern types of game, cards, lots and divination, and the mention of *avari* suggests that Maffei has gambling games principally in mind.)

the sixteenth century and known as *tarocchi appropriati*. We have already come across one example of this form, namely the *Germini sopra Quaranta Meritrice*, in which the Minchiate trumps are used. In a poem of this kind, a set of people is described by associating each of them with one of the trump subjects from the Tarot pack. In some cases, the trumps are not arranged in any particular order, and these poems are of no help to us; but, in two of them, the trumps are arranged in sequence. One of these is an anonymous poem first published by Giulio Bertoni in an essay on 'Tarocchi versificati' in 1917;[3] it describes the ladies of the court of Ferrara, and is dated by Bertoni to between 1520 and 1550, more probably nearer the later date. I shall refer to this as 'the Bertoni poem'. The other is a poem that has been attributed to Giambattista Susio (1519-1583), an attribution that has been contested. The poem has never been published in full, but excerpts are given by Ridolfo Renier in his essay 'Tarocchi di M.M. Boiardo' of 1894;[4] it concerns the ladies of the court of Pavia, and may have been written about 1570.

Before we look in detail at these various orders, a word needs to be said about the names of the cards. Tarot de Marseille trumps, and in fact all those in Italian-suited packs made anywhere outside Italy, bear their names as well as their numbers, with some slight variation on these names from one pack to another. By contrast, in Italian Tarot packs, other than those which derive from the Tarot de Marseille, the trumps never have their names inscribed on them, save for isolated cards like the *Miseria* of the Tarocco Siciliano and a few non-standard packs such as that at Rouen. We have, therefore, to appeal to literary sources for the names. Here, of course, other sources, those which name the trumps without arranging them in order, become useful. One such is a set of five sonnets on the Tarot trumps by Teofilo Folengo (1491-1544), a Mantuan author of macaronic verses; these were included in his *Caos del Triperuno*, a work published in Venice in 1527 under his pseudonym Merlin Cocai.[5] Another is Pietro

Aretino's *Le Carte Parlanti*, published in Venice in 1543; and a third is Lollio's poem, already mentioned, published in Venice in 1550. There are also two other *tarocchi appropriati*, both concerning cardinals at a conclave: one relates to the conclave of 1522, which elected Adrian VI, and the other to that of 1549-50, which elected Julius III.[6] We may add to these the lists of the trumps of the Tarocco Bolognese given in the earliest eighteenth-century accounts of the game of Tarocchino and written before numerals had been added to any of the trump cards; Bolognese players were evidently as conservative in their nomenclature as in their manner of play.[7]

Most of the cards have the same name, save for trivial variations of spelling, in all the sources. Among these, the ones with names coinciding with those used in modern Tarocco Piemontese packs, and also corresponding to those of the Tarot de Marseille (given here in the right-hand column), are as follows.

The Fool	*il Matto*	*le Mat*
The Empress	*l'Imperatrice*	*l'Impératrice*
The Emperor	*l'Imperatore*	*l'Empereur*
The Popess	*la Papessa*	*la Papesse*
Temperance	*la Temperanza*	*Tempérance*
Justice	*la Giustizia*	*la Justice*
The Devil	*il Diavolo*	*le Diable*
The Moon	*la Luna*	*la Lune*
The Sun	*il Sole*	*le Soleil*
The World	*il Mondo*	*le Monde*

There are five more whose names always appear in the same form in the early sources:

[6] The first is no. XXXII of the *Pasquinate di Pietro Aretino ed Anonime per il Conclave a l'Elezione di Adriano VI*, ed. by Vittorio Rossi, Palermo, 1891, also to be found in Mario dell'Arco, *Pasquino e le Pasquinate*, Milan, 1957, pp. 87-8. The second, an imitation of the first, was published by V. Cian in his 'Gioviana', *Giornale storico della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. XVII, 1890, pp. 338-40.

[7] Stuart R. Kaplan, in his *The Encyclopedia of Tarot*, New York, 1978, cites yet another source; on p. 30 he states that Antonio Francesco Grazzini wrote in *Tutti i trionfi, carri, mascherate o canti carnascialeschi andati per Firenze dal tempo del magnifico Lorenzo de' Medici fino all'anno 1559* about the *tarocchi* trumps. On p. 359, he repeats this claim, attributing the whole book to Grazzini. Poems by Grazzini (il Lasca) are indeed included in this collection, which he in fact edited, but I can find no reference in them or in any other poems in the volume to *tarocchi*. Perhaps Mr Kaplan was misled by the occurrence of the term *trionfi* in the title: it does not there refer to Tarot trumps or triumphs, but is used in the sense of 'triumphal processions'; see the section on Festivals in J. Burckhardt's *Civilisation of the Renaissance*.

[3] In *Poesie, leggende, costumanze del medio evo*, Modena, 1917, pp. 215-29; see pp. 220-1.

[4] In *Studi su Matteo Maria Boiardo*, ed. by N. Campanini, Bologna, 1894; see pp. 256-9.

[5] *Le opere maccheroniche di Merlin Cocai*, ed. by Attilio Portioli, vol. III, Mantua, 1890, pp. 128-33.

Fortitude always appears in them as *la Fortezza*; it is *la Force* (Strength) in the Tarot de Marseille, and likewise *la Forza* (Strength) in the Tarocco Piemontese.

Love always appears in the early sources as *l'Amore*; in the Tarot de Marseille it is *l'Amoureux* (the Lover) and in the Tarocco Piemontese *gli Amanti* (the Lovers).

Death is always called *la Morte*, as in the Tarocco Piemontese; in the Tarot de Marseille, it is almost always left unnamed.

The Star is always *la Stella* in the early sources; in the Tarot de Marseille it is, likewise, *l'Étoile* (the Star), but in the Tarocco Piemontese *le Stelle* (the Stars).

The Angel is always *l'Angelo* in the early sources, save in the Minchiate pack, in which it is *le Trombe* (the Trumpets). In the Tarot de Marseille it is *le Jugement* (the Judgment), though a pack made in Strasbourg has *la Trompette* (the Trumpet), and it is similarly referred to as *la Trompe* in Viévil's pack. In the Tarocco Piemontese it is sometimes labelled *il Giudizio* (the Judgment), but usually as *l'Angelo*.

This leaves six cards whose names vary in the early sources. For three of these, the differences are trifling.

The Bagatto, called *le Bateleur* in the Tarot de Marseille and, usually, *il Bagatto* in the Tarocco Piemontese, is referred to as *il Bagatella* in most of the early sources; Pietro Aretino alone uses the name *il Bagatto*, and only as an alternative. In the poem on the 1549 conclave, the form used is *il Bagatello*. The term is *il Bagatino* in the Bertoni poem, like the form *il Bagattino* used by Bolognese players.

The Chariot is usually called *il Carro*, as it is in the Tarocco Piemontese, corresponding to *le Chariot* in the Tarot de Marseille. In the Steele MS. and in Aretino it appears more explicitly as *il Carro triumphale* (the triumphal Chariot).

The Wheel, called *la Roue de Fortune* (the Wheel of Fortune) in the Tarot de Marseille and likewise *la Ruota di Fortuna* in the Tarocco Piemontese, is usually abbreviated to *la Rota* or *la Ruota* (the Wheel) in the early sources; only the two poems on the conclaves use the full term. However, the idea is just the same, and Fortune

is almost always mentioned in connection with this card.

The only serious variations in nomenclature are confined to three cards:

The card known to modern players as *the Hermit* – *l'Ermite* in the Tarot de Marseille (*le Capucin* in some related packs) and *l'Eremita* in the Tarocco Piemontese – has three names in the early sources. In the Steele MS., in the Bertoni poem and in Lollio, it is *il Gobbo* (the Hunchback). In Garzoni, in Susio and in the poem on the 1522 conclave, as also for Bolognese players, it is *il Vecchio* (the Old Man); compare Viévil's term *le Vielart*. In Teofilo Folengo it is *il Tempo* (Time). (Aretino and the other conclave poem fail to mention it.)

The Hanged Man – *le Pendu* in the Tarot de Marseille and *il Penduto* in the Tarocco Piemontese – is *l'Impiccato* in the Steele MS. and in Garzoni, and *l'Appicato* in Teofilo Folengo, both meaning 'the Hanged Man'. For all the rest, including the Bolognese players, it is *il Traditore* (the Traitor).

The Tower, called *la Torre* in the Tarocco Piemontese and *la Maison Dieu* (the House of God, or, perhaps, the Hospital) in the Tarot de Marseille, bears a variety of names in the early sources. In the Steele MS. it is *la Sagitta*, literally 'the Arrow' but more probably meaning 'the Thunderbolt'; for Bolognese players it was *la Saetta*, also meaning 'the Thunderbolt' (compare *la Foudre* (the Lightning) in the anonymous seventeenth-century Parisian pack, those of Viévil and de Hautot and in the Belgian Tarot). The Bertoni poem calls it *la Casa del Diavolo* (the House of the Devil), by which name it was also known to Minchiate players; the poem on the 1549 conclave has the variant *la Casa del Dannato* (the House of the Damned), while that on the 1522 conclave calls it simply *la Casa* (the House). In Garzoni, Folengo and Susio it is *il Fuoco* (the Fire). Lollio calls it *l'Inferno* (Hell) outright. Aretino leaves it unmentioned.

In order to have a uniform terminology for making comparisons between different orders, without falsely implying that a particular term is used in each of the sources, I shall in what follows use English names (save for the Bagatto). For the last three cards mentioned above, I shall use 'the

Hermit', 'the Hanged Man' and 'the Tower'.

Among the variant packs, the Tarocco Bolognese, considered in its older form before the *Papi* were replaced by Moors, contains precisely the standard trump subjects; it merely fails to yield an order among themselves for the Pope, Popess, Emperor and Empress. The Tarocco Siciliano has several unfamiliar subjects: but the Globe obviously corresponds to the World, we know from Villabianca that the Ship is a replacement for the Devil and we may reasonably assume that Jupiter stands in place of the Angel. In the Minchiate pack, the 'Grand Duke' does not correspond precisely to any card or other packs, but clearly belongs with the two Imperial cards. It is evident that the insertion of the twenty extra cards has not been allowed to disturb the order of the familiar ones; it is especially striking that the four additional Virtues have not been placed next to the three that were already there, but have been grouped together with the other new cards. We are therefore justified in extracting from the Minchiate pack an order for the standard Tarot trumps. This is confirmed by a certain feature of the design of Minchiate trumps. The trumps cards from XVI to XXXV, that is, the twenty additional ones, bear rosettes in the two top corners. Of the remaining trumps, the top five unnumbered ones and those from I to XV, only trumps I and II have rosettes in the top corners. A possible explanation is that the original designer of the Minchiate pack, whose designs were thereafter faithfully copied, used existing designs for the trumps of an ordinary Tarocco pack as far as he could, and invented new designs for the additional cards. Some adjustment would be necessary with the lowest cards, owing to the reduction in number of the Imperial/Papal cards from four to three; the purpose of the rosettes may have been to indicate to the cardmaker himself which designs he would be unable to use for ordinary 78-card Tarocco packs.

In Chapter 4 a list was given of all known surviving sets of fifteenth-century Italian Tarot cards. The first twenty of these consisted of the hand-painted cards, made for the nobility, which have survived in considerable numbers; but, in addition, there were listed, as nos. (21) to (24), four popular packs, dating from the end of the fifteenth century, from which one or more uncut sheets have survived; the Boiardo pack and the copper-engraved Sola-Busca *tarocchi*, being to a

high degree non-standard, were not included in the list. The dating of the four popular packs, (21) to (24), as late fifteenth-century, is admittedly not unshakable: any of them may be assignable to the beginning of the sixteenth. We may now extend the list to cover Italian Tarot cards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The vogue for expensive hand-painted packs died away in the sixteenth century; accepting nos. (21) to (24) of Chapter 4 as of the fifteenth century, we are left with only four sixteenth-century Italian Tarot packs of which we have any knowledge. With the numbering continued from Chapter 4, these are:

(25) A set of thirty cards belonging to the Leber Collection in the Bibliothèque Municipale at Rouen. They comprise the King, Queen, Cavalier, Jack, 9, 6 and Ace of Swords; the King, Cavalier, 9, 7, 5, 4, 2 and Ace of Batons; the 9, 8 and 7 of Cups; the King, Jack, 9 and Ace of Coins; and the Fool and seven trumps. The trumps are numbered with Arabic numerals, and are the Emperor (4), the Pope (5), the Chariot (7), the Wheel of Fortune (10), Time, corresponding to the Hermit (11), the Devil (14) and the Star (16). The pack is obviously non-standard, and is a classicised one: the court figures are labelled with inscriptions in Latin identifying them with characters of classical history (e.g. the King of Coins with Midas, King of the Lydians), while the trump cards, although clearly identifiable with the usual subjects, also have Latin inscriptions interpreting them in terms of classical mythology (e.g. the Devil is represented by Pluto and is labelled 'Perditorum Raptor'). The numeral cards are very elaborate, the Batons, in particular, being depicted as whole trees.[8]

(26) A complete pack, very closely related to the one at Rouen, but not identical with it, was known to Count Leopoldo Cicognara, and was described by him in his book on playing cards of 1831.[9] He illustrated it by all four Aces and trump cards showing Apollo and Cupid, obviously representing the Sun and Love cards. This pack has now disappeared; it evidently did not have inscriptions on

---

[8] Catalogue number 135-XIV. The cards measure 134 x 70 mm. Four are illustrated in colour by D. Hoffmann, *Die Welt der Spielkarte*, Leipzig, 1972, plate 23b, nine in black and white by Kaplan, op. cit., p. 133, and five by H.-R. D'Allemagne, *Les Cartes à jouer*, vol. I, Paris, 1906, opposite p. 186.

[9] See L. Cicognara, *Memorie spettanti alla Storia della Calcografia*, Prato, 1831, pp. 163-6 and plate XIV; A.M. Hind, *Early Italian Engraving*, vol. I, London, 1938, pp. 241 and 243, and vol. V, London, 1948, pp. 139-40; and D. Hoffmann, op. cit., fig. 6. Hind attributes the pack to Nicoletto da Modena.

the trump or court cards, nor, apparently, numerals on the trumps. The Aces differ considerably from those at Rouen; furthermore, the Fool of the Rouen pack is quite different from that described, though not illustrated, by Cicognara. Cicognara's Fool was a drunkard lying on his back, supporting, with his legs in the air, a jar marked MUSCATELLO. The Fool of the Rouen set shows a man armed to the teeth and dressed in armour, but with genitals exposed and urinating; the inscription reads 'VELIM FUNDAM DARI MIHI'. Nevertheless, Cicognara's pack was a classicised one of very much the same kind as that at Rouen.

(27) A single card, showing the Devil, is in the British Musuem.[10] The back gives the maker's name as Agnolo Hebreo. It is unnumbered, and the design is very similar to that on the Rothschild sheet (no. (23)), but it is much cruder in execution.

(28) Another isolated card is in the Museo Nazionale delle Arti e Tradizioni Popolari in Rome: it is numbered VIII and represents Love.[11] It shows two musicians playing a viol da gamba and a lute, and, behind them, a pair of embracing lovers: above them, as usual on all versions of this card, hovers Cupid aiming his bow. The design does not correspond in detail to any other known version, but is in no way surprising.

This may appear a meagre crop for a whole century, but compares favourably with the single surviving pack from sixteenth-century France. As before, we cannot be certain, when dealing with Italy, that we have identified all surviving cards from Tarot packs; it is possible that some of the suit cards that have survived in fact come from such packs, without our having any means of knowing this. The wealth of literary references assures us that the game continued, in the sixteenth century, to enjoy both popularity and renown. It is unnecessary to list Tarocchino and Minchiate packs made in the seventeenth century, since they are readily identifiable as such; when these are set aside, our list may be extended to the seventeenth century as follows:

(29) A set of six *tarocchi* was found, among other cards, at the Castello Sforzesco in Milan during restoration work. They consist of the 6, 7 and 9 of Swords, the 8 of Batons, the 6 of Coins and the World, numbered XXI. They measure 138 x 68 mm., and have backs showing a complex design identified by

Francesco Novati as depicting Ruggero and Angelica; the design has a dotted border, folded over to form a similar border for the faces of the cards. The backs, and consequently the borders, have peeled off from the 8 of Batons, 9 of Swords and the World. The suit cards resemble those of the Tarot de Marseille very closely, with the major exception that they bear no numerals to indicate their rank, and the minor one that, on the odd-numbered cards of the Swords suit, the crosspiece of the single sword is straight, not S-shaped as in most Tarot de Marseille packs (a Tarot de Besançon made in 1784 by Bernhard Schaer of Mümliswil being an exception). The single trump, the World, is similar in general design, though not in precise detail, to the corresponding card in the Tarot de Marseille, showing a naked female figure enclosed in an oval wreath, with the symbols of the four Evangelists at the corners. The card does not bear an inscription giving its name. It is inscribed XXI above the top margin, but this inscription would have been covered by the border folded over from the back when the card was in its original condition. Novati assigns these cards to the early sixteenth century; but they seem more likely to be from some date in the seventeenth.[12]

(30) Two incomplete uncut sheets from a Portuguese-suited Tarot pack are in the British Museum. One shows the Maids of Swords and Batons, the Cavalier of Batons and fragments of the 3 of Swords and Cavalier of Coins. The other shows trumps bearing Arabic numerals but not names: they consist of the Wheel (11), the Chariot (10), Love (6), a card depicting a Sultan and numbered 5, and two fragmentary cards numbered 20 and 21, presumably the World and the Angel respectively. The 2 of Swords bears the inscription 'Alla Colonna in Piazza Nicosia'. Italian cardmakers from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century identified themselves by signs which, like English inn-signs, presumably hung outside their workshops; usually the sign itself and its name appear on the backs of the cards. The pack is thought to have been made in Rome, there being a Piazza Nicosia in that city. There are also in the British Museum two fragmentary sheets from a regular Portuguese-suited pack by the same maker, showing the Kings, Cavaliers, Maids and Aces of all four suits, and the 2 to 6 and fragments of the 7 and 9 of the Swords suit. A column, which was also the heraldic emblem of the Colonna family, appears on a shield borne by the Maid of Swords in both packs, and on one borne by the Maid of Cups in the regular pack; on the 2 of Swords of the regular pack appears the date 1613. The small details of design of the cards

[10] Illustrated in D. Hoffmann, op. cit., plate 14a.
[11] Illustrated in *Antiche Carte da Tarocchi*, Rome, 1961, plate XII. The back shows a standing Cupid.

[12] The cards are in the Raccolta delle Stampe Achille Bertarelli at the Castello Sforzesco. For Novati's articles, see footnote 22.

common to both packs are not precisely the same, but the pattern used is identical, and corresponds closely to that of other Portuguese-suited packs made at the time when this had become recognised as a quite distinct suit-system. In both packs, the Maids are girls with long gowns, and the Swords are straight but intersecting; further, each suit card has an index at both top centre and bottom centre (FS, FB, FC and FD for the Maids, RS, etc., for the Kings, CS, etc., for the Cavaliers, AS, etc., for the Aces and S2, S3, etc., for the numeral cards from 2 up). In the regular pack, the Kings are seated, there are dragons on the Aces and the Batons have a shape very characteristic of Portuguese-suited packs.[13]

(31) There are several extant examples of a puzzling kind of pack made by a cardmaker using the name 'Orfeo': the backs of his cards give this name with an elaborate design of Orpheus playing his lute. The Beinecke Library at Yale has two nearly complete ones and another, very fragmentary, one; two others are in the British Museum, while the Fournier Museum in Vitoria has fragments of three packs (and one card from a fourth).[14] These packs are invariably catalogued as incomplete Minchiate packs. The reason is that the trumps display exactly the designs of the Minchiate ones: the top five trumps, left unnumbered in the Minchiate pack, are unnumbered in the Orfeo packs also, and those that are numbered bear the same numbers as in the Minchiate pack. Furthermore, as in the Minchiate pack, the Swords are straight but intersecting. In other respects, however, the Orfeo packs deliberately diverge from the highly constant Minchiate designs. This is true of the Fool and of the Aces, and in some degree of the Kings; but the most striking divergences are in the two lower court cards. In the Minchiate pack, the Cavaliers, although still called *Cavalli*, are centaurs in Swords and Batons, and other half-human, half-animal creatures in Cups and Coins; but in the Orfeo packs, they are the conventional mounted knights. In the Minchiate pack, the Cups and Coins suits, though not the other two, have Maids instead of Jacks as the lowest court cards; but in the Orfeo packs, there are distinctly male Jacks in all four suits, and their designs in no way resemble the Minchiate ones. If

[13] See *Playing Cards of Various Ages and Countries selected from the Collection of Lady Charlotte Schreiber*, vol. III, London, 1895, plates 44 and 45. The Tarot pack, but not the regular one, is illustrated in Kaplan, op. cit., p. 134.

[14] The new catalogue no. of the more complete Orfeo pack in the Cary Collection at Yale is ITA-63; the old no. was I-11, the other Orfeo pack being I-96. The Orfeo packs in the Fournier Museum are grouped as no. 10 in the Italian section of the catalogue. For the British Museum ones, see F.M. O'Donoghue, *Catalogue of the Collection of Playing Cards bequeathed to the Trustees of the British Museum by the late Lady Charlotte Schreiber*, London, 1901, I-59 and I-60.

there were anything to compel us to regard the Orfeo packs as intended for the game of Minchiate, we should have to treat them as exhibiting certain deviant features; but there is not. Although the designs of all surviving trump cards from Orfeo packs coincide with those used in Minchiate packs, no Orfeo pack is known which has any of those twenty trump subjects which are peculiar to the Minchiate pack, which, unlike every other form of the Tarot pack, had in all forty trumps (in addition to the Fool). The probability is, therefore, that the Orfeo packs were originally 78-card ones. Perhaps the designs used were not at that time regarded as the exclusive property of the Minchiate pack, which had probably taken them over, at the time of its invention in the previous century, from some local standard pattern for the normal Tarot pack; or, possibly, the cardmaker using the sign Orfeo found it more economical to use Minchiate blocks, so far as he could, to produce ordinary 78-card Tarot packs. This conclusion cannot be regarded as certain, however, because one oddity remains. In none of the Orfeo packs I have mentioned is there any trump below IX (or VIIII as it is written). To make a complete set of Tarot trumps, there would have to be nine such trumps, perhaps leaving the Bagatto unnumbered, or, just conceivably, with a trump XVI to insert between the extant XV (the Tower) and the five top unnumbered trumps: in any case, they would have to diverge in some respect from the Minchiate trumps, which do not include the Pope and Popess and have only the eight trumps numbered I to VIII below the IX. It may be mere coincidence that these nine trumps happen to be missing from all surviving examples of the Orfeo pack; but, until an example is found that includes some of them, it remains a fact that seems to call for explanation, and, until one is hit on, we cannot feel assured that we have correctly interpreted the pack.

Considering the rarity of pre-eighteenth-century cards generally, we cannot regard this as a poor haul; and we have, in addition, seventeenth-century examples both of the Minchiate and Tarocchino packs. Nevertheless, the dearth of literary and textual references, save to Minchiate, from this century suggests that the popularity of the game of Tarocco, as played with the 78-card pack, was distinctly on the wane in mainland Italy, though Minchiate and Tarocchino continued to flourish. In the next century, of course, games with the 78-card pack were to enjoy a great revival in Lombardy and Piedmont.

Of all these packs, made in Italy between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries inclusive,

there are, apart from the Minchiate and Tarocchino packs, just nine that yield an order, complete or incomplete, for the trump cards. Two of these are fifteenth-century ones printed from wood blocks and preserved in the form of uncut sheets: that in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, no. (21) of Chapter 4; and that in the Rosenwald Collection in Washington, no. (22) of Chapter 4. The Metropolitan set includes an almost complete sequence of trumps, of which the World is definitely unnumbered, and the rest appear to have borne Roman numerals from I to XX. The sheets are mutilated, so that a few of the trumps are missing or fragmentary. Only the tops of the Pope, Emperor, Popess and Empress survive, bearing the numerals II to V, but only the Popess (III) can be identified with certainty, although, given that, the positions of the others admit of little doubt. Another card of which only the top remains may be either the Bagatto or the Fool: no numeral is to be seen. There is only the right-hand half of the Chariot, without the numeral. Of three cards, only the left-hand halves survive: one is easily identified as the Hanged Man, with a numeral beginning XI.. that can only be XII; one appears to be the Star, with a numeral beginning XV.., which would have to be XVI, but may possibly be the Moon, in which case the numeral must be XVII; and the third, which is also truncated below, is unidentifiable and shows no numeral, but is probably Fortitude. Save for the relative positions of Fortitude and the Chariot, it is possible to reconstruct the order completely with virtual certainty.

In the Rosenwald set, all the trumps, without the Fool, are printed on one sheet, together with three Queens. The only mutilated card is the Wheel, on which the numeral, if there was one, can no longer be seen. Unlike on the Metropolitan sheets, the trumps are arranged on the sheet more or less in sequence. The bottom line contains the three Queens and the first five trumps from the Bagatto (I) to the Pope (V). The middle line begins with Love (VI), Temperance (VII) and Justice (VIII). These are followed by Fortitude, also numbered VIII, and the Chariot, numbered X. Evidently the VIII on Fortitude is a mistake for VIIII. There follows the Hermit, numbered XII, the Hanged Man, which is definitely unnumbered, and the Wheel, of which we cannot tell whether it had a numeral. The cards on the top line, running from Death to the

Angel, are all unnumbered, and are arranged in a plausible order, indeed, in what, by analogy with other packs, is the only possible order, given the numbers assigned to the other cards. There are two possible hypotheses about the end of the second line. One is that the cards are arranged in the correct sequence, but that the Hermit has been misnumbered XII instead of XI. On this hypothesis, proposed by Sylvia Mann, the Wheel was not numbered, and the numbering stopped at XI. An alternative hypothesis seems to me a little more probable. This is that the Hermit is correctly numbered XII, and that the Wheel was numbered XI, but was located slightly out of sequence on the block. I shall follow this second hypothesis in the comparative table given below.

Although fifteenth-century hand-painted packs do not usually have numerals on the trumps, there are two exceptions to this. One is the celebrated 'Charles VI' pack, no. (4) in Chapter 4. A fact seldom referred to in the extensive discussions of this pack in the literature is that the trumps bear lower-case Roman numerals at the very top, in a fifteenth-century hand. Robert Steele listed these in his 1900 *Archaeologia* article. The cards are in fact printed from a wood block with the colours subsequently painted by hand; and, on the basis of some technical considerations concerning the process of production, Steele asserted that the numerals were written on the cards before they were painted. Detlef Hoffmann has denied this, maintaining that the numerals were added later, and were not intended to be part of the original designs. In this he is almost certainly right. They do not lose their importance for that reason: they represent an order which, at an early period, their owner at the time thought they ought to have. I have not seen these cards myself, and rely on Steele for the numbering. In one particular, he seems likely to be wrong: he gives the numeral for the Pope as ii, and adds a question mark to show his uncertainty about the reading. But the Pope can hardly rank lower than the Emperor, which is iij; moreover, in every other case, a terminal i is written j. It is therefore probable that the numeral on the Pope was intended to be iiij.

The other exception is the very incomplete Catania set no. (7) in Chapter 4. On three of the four surviving trumps Arabic numerals have at some time been inscribed in ink; these inscriptions cannot be contemporary with the cards, and may be conjectured to have been

made in the seventeenth century. The fourth surviving trump is the figure on the stag, which Ronald Decker has interpreted as an unusual representation of Temperance; to this no numeral has been added, presumably because whoever added them could not identify the subject.

From the sixteenth century we have two remnants of packs with numbered trumps. One is the single card at Rome depicting Love and numbered VIII, no. (28) above. The other is the classicised pack at Rouen, no. (25) above, whose trumps, readily identified with their counterparts in ordinary packs, bear Arabic numerals and inscriptions giving their names in Latin; I differ from Detlef Hoffmann in equating Pluto, not, as he does, with Death, but with the Devil.

Finally, there are three fragmentary packs from the seventeenth century. One is the very incomplete sheet of trump cards for the Portuguese-suited alla Colonna pack, no. (30) above; this has Arabic numerals, which were presumably borne by all the trumps, since they go up to 21. The second is the Orfeo pack, no. (31) above, of which several examples exist; this has Roman numerals, but the top five trumps are unnumbered, as in the Minchiate pack. Finally, there is the set of six Tarot cards found at the Castello Sforzesco, of which only one is a trump, the World, numbered XXI.

From the four literary sources and from the three variant types of Tarot pack, we obtain complete orders for all the trumps; from the nine fragmentary early packs with numbered trumps, we obtain further orders with varying degrees of incompleteness, of which those of the Metropolitan Museum, Rosenwald and Charles VI packs can be reconstructed in their entirety with very little uncertainty. Of the orders which we know in complete detail, only two agree exactly, those given by Garzoni and in the Bertoni poem; the order in the Metropolitan Museum pack almost certainly also nearly coincides with that in these two sources, and that of the Rouen pack may very well have done so as well. The order in the alla Colonna pack may have been the same as that in the Rosenwald pack, save for carrying the numbering through to 21 and having a Sultan in place of the Pope; the order underlying the numbering on the three Catania cards may have been the same as in the Orfeo pack, save that the numbering is carried at least as far as 19. All the rest have at least minor

differences between them. Ignoring the isolated Love card at Rome, we thus have eleven distinct orders, all differing from the Tarot de Marseille order.

This is a very surprising fact. Games players do not in the least mind having to master a complicated and arbitrary sequential ordering (for instance, the ranking, in 'civil' and 'military' suits, of dominoes in Chinese domino games); but they do require that any such ordering be held constant. It is of the essence of Tarot games that there be a determinate means of deciding which card in any trick is the winning one, and this necessarily requires an agreed ordering of the trump cards; in special cases there may be exceptions, such as the equal ranking of the *Papi* or Moors in the Bolognese game, but anything of this kind is necessarily an exception, not the general rule, and, indeed, this is the only known such exception. If play is to be possible, the ranking of the trumps must be apparent to all players and subject to no dispute.

How, then, are we to explain the variations that we find in the order of the trumps in Italy from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century? One explanation, which we glanced at earlier, can be ruled out immediately, although it has been proposed by some, the suggestion, namely, that the Tarot trumps did not originally have an order at all. If what, in the early chapters of this book, we called the triumph cards did not have an order, they were not trumps, and the game played with the pack cannot have been a trick-taking game; in that case, the suit cards cannot have had an order either, since it is only in trick-taking games that an order is required. We should then have to suppose that, at some time between the first invention of the Tarot pack in the 1430s and its spread to France and the appearance of packs with numbered trump cards, say around 1480, a new type of game was invented, for play with the Tarot pack, and a new employment, within this game, found for the triumph cards, namely as genuine trumps. We should have to assume this, to account for the etymological connection between *triumphi* and 'trump', for the subsequent history of the game of Tarot in Italy and in France, and for the reversed ranking, in the two pairs of suits, of the numeral cards, already going out in Italy by the beginning of the sixteenth century, as the game of Trappola shows. Above all, we should have to assume it to explain the fact that, from the author of the fifteenth-century

Steele sermon on, writers assign an order to the trump cards. But then we are faced with the same problem as before: why are the orders different in different sources? The hypothesis completely fails to explain that which it was its sole object to explain. We have no evidence that the trump cards ever lacked an order; we have abundant evidence that they had an order: our problem is that this order is not constant. It is no explanation of the variations in the order to propose that, at the start, there was no order at all.

A more specious explanation is that, once it became the practice to inscribe numerals on the trumps, it ceased to be important to maintain a fixed order for the trump subjects. Our surprise at the variations in order is due, on this view, to our being accustomed to the Italian-suited packs used outside Italy, with their unswerving uniformity of order: but there was in fact no need for such uniformity. In the early French-suited packs which have animals on the trumps, it is common to find the same selection of animals arranged in different orders; in the same way, the standard selection of trump subjects in the Latin-suited packs may have varied without causing any confusion.

The idea underlying this suggestion is that, once the trump cards bore numerals, the players would have identified them from those numerals and not from the subjects depicted, as they unquestionably did from the start with the French-suited packs. But this idea is borne out neither by the early Italian Tarot cards that survive to us, nor by the literary references. It *is* correct, indeed, for the Minchiate trumps, which were too numerous for anyone to memorise the order of any but the five top cards, the *arie*; and, accordingly, in literary sources, the first thirty-five Minchiate trumps are virtually always referred to by number and not by name; we do not even know what subject Minchiate trump II was intended to represent. By contrast, the *tarocchi* trumps are *never* referred to by number; of the various literary texts that mention them, only one, the Steele MS. sermon, even cites their numbers. Of the four sets of fifteenth-century sheets for Tarot cards, the Cary sheet and the Rothschild/Beaux Arts sheets have no numerals at all, while the Rosenwald sheet leaves as many as nine cards unnumbered; and we know that at Bologna it was not until the later eighteenth century that any of the trumps began to be numbered. On the trump cards of the later

French-suited Tarot packs, the numerals form one of the most prominent features. In those used in Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and, eventually, France, these numerals are contained in a separate panel extending across the card; though this is not true of the packs made in the Austrian Empire, the numerals are still very prominent. This is not so with the early Italian cards. Only on the alla Colonna trumps are the Arabic numerals clear and regularly placed. The numerals on the Metropolitan Museum trumps are quite insignificantly placed; for instance, the figures XV appear on the left of the head of the Angel, while the remainder of the numeral, IIII, is set on the right; on the Sun card, the figure XVIII is set more than half-way down the card, just above the trees on which the Sun is shining. One can hardly suppose that these numerals were intended as more than a last resort in identifying the cards. Something very interesting happens in the Minchiate pack. On the trumps peculiar to that pack, trumps XVI to XXXV, the numerals are placed in a scroll at the top of each card, making them easy to pick out; but, on the fifteen lowest trumps, the numerals are placed in a much more random fashion in blank spaces of the design. It is probable that these lowest trumps – or at least those from V to XV – represent designs originally used for trumps of a 78-card *tarocchi* pack, taken over when the Minchiate pack was first invented. The numerals on the Orfeo trumps are, of course, placed in the same way, and those of the Rosenwald sheet, though clearer than the Metropolitan Museum ones, are also far from being very prominent. As for the numeral on the Castello Sforzesco World card, it would have been invisible to a player, and perhaps was intended only as a reminder for the cardmaker himself.

From all this it is plain that Italian players were highly conscious of the trump subjects, and did not rely principally upon the numerals in order to identify the cards. If the true explanation of the variation in the order of the subjects were that the subjects did not matter, the cards being identified by numeral, we should expect that at least the subjects of the really important cards would have been held constant; yet we shall find that the variation affects even the top three trumps. In some orders, the Angel is the highest trump, followed by the World and then by the Sun; in others, the World is the highest, followed by Justice and only then by the Angel; or, again,

the World may be the highest, the Angel second highest and then the Sun. For the variations to be explicable on the ground that the players were indifferent to the subjects associated with the numbers, they woud have had to be altogether oblivious to them for the variations at this level to have passed unnoticed, whereas, from the way in which the trumps are referred to in the literary sources, it is apparent that they were not. The most striking example of the importance of the subjects, at least at the highest level, is the persistence in Piedmont of the tradition that the Angel beats the World, in face of the contrary numerical ordering on the cards being used. It seems probable, rather, that the very reverse of the present suggestion is close to the truth; that just as, at Bologna, a player of *tarocchi* had, until the later eighteenth century, to make the fixed conventional ordering of the trumps second nature to him, so players of other varieties of Tarot, save for Minchiate, identified the trump cards principally by subject, and were aware of, and could have stated, the order of those subjects.

If this was so, it would have been hopelessly confusing for the players if the order of the trumps had varied even in minor respects from one pack of cards to another. The observable variations in the order must therefore be due, not to the absence of a fixed order, but to that phenomenon evident throughout the entire history of the game of Tarot: the extreme localisation of specific modes of play. Again and again we find that the players in one city or town play only amongst themselves and do not know those of a neighbouring town; the detailed rules, and sometimes the whole type of game played, diverge from locality to locality, the players in one circle being quite unaware of the manner of play of those in another, and, often, of their very existence. The different orders for the trumps that we find in Italy must represent different practices adopted in different cities, presumably at a stage earlier than that at which numerals came regularly to be inscribed on the trump cards. Evidently, quite a short time after the game of Tarot had first been invented, players in various cities or regions developed local peculiarities in their modes of play, which, in Italy, extended to the conventional order of the trumps; this must have happened before it became usual anywhere to inscribe numerals on the trump cards, and hence before the end of the

fifteenth century. Modern players might feel that it would be impossible to memorise the order of twenty-one trump subjects so accurately as to be at once aware, without the need for reflection, which card was superior to which; but, as we know from the Bolognese game, this doubt is quite misplaced. The different orders of the trumps testify, not to a reliance on the numerals alone, but to the existence, at an early date, of wide local variation in the manner of play.

When we look closely at the various orders, we find that there was far from being total chaos. A first impression is of a good deal of regularity which, however, is hard to specify. Now the cards which wander most unrestrainedly within the sequence, from one ordering to another, are the three Virtues. If we remove these three cards, and consider the sequence formed by the remaining eighteen trump cards, it becomes very easy to state those features of their arrangement which remain constant in all the orderings. Ignoring the Virtues, we can say that the sequence of the remaining trumps falls into three distinct segments, an initial one, a middle one and a final one, all variation in order occurring only *within* these different segments.

The first segment consists of the Bagatto and the four Papal and Imperial cards (three in the Minchiate pack, two only in the Tarocco Siciliano). Save in the Tarocco Siciliano, where the *Miseria* or *Povertà* comes below it, the Bagatto is always the lowest trump. The Pope, when present, is always the highest member of this initial segment. In all known Italian trump orders, the Emperor ranks higher than the Empress, as one might expect; but it will be recalled that in the pack made at Rouen by Adam de Hautot, and also in the list given in the *Maison académique des jeux* of 1659, the Empress outranks her spouse. In Italian trump orders, on the other hand, the only opportunity for variation within this segment lies in the position of the Popess. In different orders, she occupies one of three possible positions: immediately below the Pope and above the Emperor; below the Emperor but above the Empress; and below even the Empress.

The middle segment consists of five cards, of which the typical order is, from lowest to highest: Love, the Chariot, the Wheel, the Hermit, the Hanged Man. That very order is found in the Tarocco Bolognese, the Charles VI numbering (the Wheel cannot have come anywhere but at

no. 10), the Rosenwald pack (on the above hypothesis as to the intended order), the Steele sermon, Susio's poem and the Viévil pack; the alla Colonna pack must also have had that order, unless the Hermit and the Hanged Man were reversed. In all other cases, the order within this segment results from interchanging some one pair of adjacent cards: in the Minchiate and Orfeo packs (and presumably in the numbering of the Catania cards), the Wheel and the Chariot have been interchanged; in the Tarocco Siciliano the Hermit and the Hanged Man; in Garzoni's book, the Bertoni poem and probably the Metropolitan Museum pack, Love and the Chariot; and, in the Tarot de Marseille, the Wheel and the Hermit. (If Miss Mann's hypothesis, mentioned above, concerning the order in the Rosenwald pack be adopted in preference to mine, that pack forms the sole exception to this rule.)

The final segment consists of Death, the Devil, the Tower, the Star, the Moon, the Sun, the World and the Angel. These always occur (ignoring possible intervening Virtues) in precisely the order just stated, with the sole but very important exception that, sometimes, the position of the World and the Angel are reversed, the World coming highest.

If, now, in the light of this analysis, we look at the actual orders, we see that they divide into three sharply distinct types, which I shall arbitrarily label type A, type B and type C. These types are to be distinguished according to two principles: where the Virtues come; and whether the Angel or the World is the highest

card. In type A, the Angel is the highest trump, the World coming immediately below it. The three Virtues, Temperance, Fortitude and Justice, occur consecutively, usually interposed just above the lowest card of the middle segment, which, in orders of this type, at least whenever we can tell, is invariably Love. Type A is not attested by any of our four literary sources. On the other hand, it is well supported by actual packs. All three variant packs – the Tarocco Bolognese, the Tarocco Siciliano and the Minchiate pack – belong to this type; so do the Charles VI numbering and the Rosenwald and Orfeo packs. So also must the alla Colonna pack have done: at least, if the three Virtues did not come between Love as no. 6 and the Chariot as no. 10, the order must have been very non-standard. Almost certainly the Catania numbering also exemplifies this type: the numbering of the Chariot as 10 and the Hermit as 11 surely implies that all three Virtues ranked below the Chariot, and the World as 19 must have ranked below the Angel.

In orders of type A, the three Virtues rank immediately above Love, except in the Tarocco Siciliano pack, where they rank immediately below it, and in the Tarocco Bolognese, where they outrank the second lowest card of the middle segment, the Chariot. In type A orders, Temperance is always the lowest of the three Virtues, whenever we can tell. In the Tarocco Bolognese and the Rosenwald pack, Fortitude is higher than Justice, but in the Tarocco Siciliano, the Minchiate pack and the Charles VI numbering, it is Justice which is higher.

Tar. Bolognese	Minchiate	Tar. Siciliano	Charles VI	Rosenwald	alla Colonna	Orfeo	Catania
Angel	Angel	20 Jupiter	20 Angel	Angel	21 ?	Angel	
World	World	19 Globe	19 World	World	20 ?	World	19 World
Sun	Sun	18 Sun	18 Sun	Sun		Sun	
Moon	Moon	17 Moon	17 Moon	Moon		Moon	
16 Star	Star	16 Star		Star		Star	
15 Tower	....	15 Tower	15 Tower	Tower		15 Tower	
14 Devil	15 Tower	14 Ship		Devil		14 Devil	
13 Death	14 Devil	13 Death	13 Death	Death		13 Death	
12 Hanged Man	13 Death	12 Hermit	12 Hanged Man	Hanged Man		12 Hanged Man	
11 Hermit	12 Hanged Man	11 Hanged Man	11 Hermit	12 Hermit		11 Hermit	11 Hermit
10 Wheel	11 Hermit	10 Wheel		? 11 Wheel	11 Wheel	10 Chariot	10 Chariot
9 Fortitude	10 Chariot	9 Chariot	9 Chariot	10 Chariot	10 Chariot	9 Wheel	
8 Justice	9 Wheel	8 Love	8 Justice	9 Fortitude			
7 Temperance	8 Justice	7 Justice	7 Fortitude	8 Justice			
6 Chariot	7 Fortitude	6 Fortitude	6 Temperance	7 Temperance			
5 Love	6 Temperance	5 Temperance	5 Love	6 Love	6 Love		
Pope	5 Love	4 Constancy	? 4 Pope	5 Pope	5 Sultan		
Popess	4 Eastern Emperor	3 Emperor	3 Emperor	4 Emperor			
Emperor	3 Western Emperor	2 Empress		3 Empress			
Empress	2 'Grand Duke'	1 Bagatto		2 Popess			
Bagatto	1 Bagatto	Poverty		1 Bagatto		*TYPE A*	

In orders of type B, something completely different happens. In these, the World is the highest trump, and Justice is promoted to the second highest position in the sequence, coming immediately below the World and above the Angel, the third highest card. There is clearly here an association of ideas: the Angel proclaims the last Judgment, at which justice will be dispensed. In orders of type B, Temperance always comes immediately above the Pope, and is separated from Fortitude, which comes three cards later, after Love and the Chariot. There is very little variation in these orders: the Popess does not have a stable position, and, in the Steele MS., the positions of Love and the Chariot have been reversed.

Type B has by far the best literary attestation, namely in three out of our four sources, including the earliest one, the Steele MS. The other two are Garzoni and the Bertoni poem, which give exactly the same type B order. The type is also exemplified by the Metropolitan Museum pack, and, incomplete as it is, by the Rouen pack. The isolated card at Rome, Love, numbered 8, probably also comes from a pack with a type B order, although this cannot be certain, there being one type A order, that of the Tarocco Siciliano, in which Love bears the number 8.

Steele MS.	Garzoni & Bertoni	Metrop. Mus.	Rouen
21 World	World	World	
20 Justice	Justice	20 Justice	
19 Angel	Angel	19 Angel	
18 Sun	Sun	18 Sun	
17 Moon	Moon	?17 Moon	
16 Star	Star	or ?16 Star	16 Star
15 Tower	Tower	15 Tower	
14 Devil	Devil	14 Devil	14 Devil
13 Death	Death	13 Death	
12 Hanged Man	Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man	
11 Hermit	Hermit	11 Hermit	11 Hermit
10 Wheel	Wheel	10 Wheel	10 Wheel
9 Fortitude	Fortitude	? ?Fortitude	
8 Chariot	Love	8 Love	
7 Love	Chariot	? Chariot	7 Chariot
6 Temperance	Temperance	6 Temperance	
5 Pope	Pope	5 ?Pope	5 Pope
4 Popess	Popess	4 ?Emperor	4 Emperor
3 Emperor	Emperor	3 Popess	
2 Empress	Empress	2 ?Empress	
1 Bagatto	Bagatto	? ?Bagatto	

TYPE B

We have only one certain attestation to an order of type C as being used in Italy before the eighteenth century, namely Susio's poem. If we knew nothing of non-Italian Tarot cards, or of the post-1700 Lombard and Piedmontese patterns,

we might dismiss type C as a minor curiosity; but, as the type to which not only the Tarot de Marseille order, but all those used outside Italy, belong, it is of course of great importance. Susio's order is considerably different from that of the Tarot de Marseille; it is, in fact, almost precisely the order found in Viévil's pack, save for the relative order of the Empress and Popess. In an order of type C, the World is again the highest card in the sequence, but, this time, the Angel comes immediately below it. Of the Virtues, it is Temperance that is promoted to a relatively high position, namely to just above Death and just below the Devil; any symbolic appropriateness in this escapes me. The remaining two Virtues are again separated and scattered within the middle segment, Justice in all cases coming lower. In Viévil's and Susio's orders, Justice comes just above the first card of the middle segment, Love, and Fortitude just above the next one, the Chariot. In the Tarot de Marseille, Justice comes above the first two cards of the middle segment, Love and the Chariot, and Fortitude above the next two, the Hermit and the Wheel. The single trump card, the World, numbered XXI, from the Castello Sforzesco set, in itself of course indicates no more than that the order was of type B or type C.

It will be remembered, in connection with the following table, that, in Viévil's pack, as in those of de Hautot and of the anonymous Parisian cardmaker, as well as in the Belgian Tarot, trump XVI is actually called the Lightning and does not show a tower; nor does that by Catelin Geoffroy, though we do not know what name it bore. The order in the anonymous Parisian pack coincides with that of the Tarot de Marseille; so do those of the Tarot de Besançon and of the Belgian Tarot, save for the difference of subjects on trumps II and V. With the same reservation, the order in de Hautot's pack coincides with that given by the *Maison académique*. It is apparent from the table that the order in Catelin Geoffroy's pack, unless very eccentric, must have been that of the Tarot de Marseille; virtually the only alternative is that the Wheel was numbered VIII and Justice and Fortitude X and XI, which is quite unlikely.

While literally true, it is somewhat misleading to say that ten or eleven distinct orders were known in Italy before the eighteenth century. The variations within type B are very minor ones. Those within type A are more considerable: but

Susio	Viévil	Geoffroy	T. de Marseille	Maison acad.
World	21 World		21 World	21 World
Angel	20 Angel	20 Angel	20 Angel	20 Angel
Sun	19 Sun		19 Sun	19 Sun
Moon	18 Moon		18 Moon	18 Moon
Star	17 Star		17 Star	17 Star
Tower	16 Tower	16 Tower	16 Tower	16 Tower
Devil	15 Devil		15 Devil	15 Devil
Temperance	14 Temperance	14 Temperance	14 Temperance	14 Temperance
Death	13 Death	13 Death	13 Death	13 Death
Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man	12 Hanged Man
Hermit	11 Hermit		11 Fortitude	11 Fortitude
Wheel	10 Wheel		10 Wheel	10 Wheel
Fortitude	9 Fortitude	9 Hermit	9 Hermit	9 Hermit
Chariot	8 Chariot		8 Justice	8 Justice
Justice	7 Justice	7 Chariot	7 Chariot	7 Chariot
Love	6 Love		6 Love	6 Love
Pope	5 Pope	5 Pope	5 Pope	5 Pope
Emperor	4 Emperor	4 Emperor	4 Emperor	4 Empress
Popess	3 Empress	3 Empress	3 Empress	3 Emperor
Empress	2 Popess	2 Popess	2 Popess	2 Popess
Bagatto	1 Bagatto	1 Bagatto	1 Bagatto	1 Bagatto

TYPE C

if we set aside the Tarocco Siciliano, in which we know that some dislocation occurred, the major deviation is seen to occur in the Bolognese order, in which the Virtues are placed after the Chariot instead of before it; for the rest, the variations within this type are, so far as we know, again comparatively minor. We may thus regard Italian Tarot players of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries as having observed three, or perhaps four, distinct basic orderings of the trumps, with small variations from one area to another.

So far we have paid no attention to the numbering of the trumps; it might be thought that this followed automatically from their order, but this is not so. If we study the various numberings, we find very little in the way of any close association of numbers with particular subjects. Almost the only such association is that of the number 13 with Death. Even that is not invariable: but it occurs more frequently than the association of a particular number with any other card, even that of the number 1 with the Bagatto. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the cardmakers, or those for whose tastes they were catering, regarded this association as particularly appropriate, and strove to arrange for it. Even today, some superstition attaches to this card among certain card players: a student who played French Tarot with lorry drivers in France, using a Tarot de Marseille pack, reported that they considered it bad luck to be dealt trump XIII, and would not, in such an event, enter the bidding, however strong a hand they otherwise had.

Now if one has the trumps arranged in an order of type A, and begins the numbering with the lowest trump, Death receives the number 14. This can be seen from the Rosenwald pack, where the numbering stops at 12: if it had been continued, the number 14 would be assigned to Death. It is probable that this consequence was accepted in the alla Colonna pack; it must have been accepted if the order in that pack was truly of type A, and none of the cards of the middle segment was promoted above Death. But there was a solution which allowed Death to be assigned the number 13 in an ordering of type A, and this can be seen from the Tarocco Bolognese. In the Tarocco Bolognese, only trumps 5 to 16 are numbered: but if the numbering is continued, it will only reach 20; the Moon will become no. 17, the Sun no. 18, the World no. 19 and the Angel no. 20. This is because Love, as no. 5, has, not four, but five cards below it. We could not number the Moors, because they are all equal: but, if they were numbered, they would occupy positions 1 to 4, leaving no number for the Bagatto, which would thus have to be regarded as an unnumbered card ranking below the numbered ones, like the *Miseria* in the Tarocco Siciliano.

We can see that the principle of starting the numbering with the second lowest trump, followed in the Tarocco Siciliano and, in a concealed fashion, in the Tarocco Bolognese, also

underlies the numbering of the Charles VI trumps. In that numbering, the Angel holds the highest place, and has the number 20. There is no other card which could possibly rank above it as no. 21: the World is numbered 19, and Justice is numbered 8. On the assumption that the Popess and the Empress were present to occupy between them the positions numbered 1 and 2, the numbering must have begun after the Bagatto, in order to bring Death out as no. 13. The numbering of the Catania cards provides another example.

The Orfeo pack presumably supplies yet another instance of the practice: there can hardly be any cards other than the five unnumbered ones to rank above the highest-numbered one, the 15, so that, to have a full complement of twenty-one trumps, there must be nine cards below the lowest-numbered one surviving in any of the packs, the 9. If the Orfeo packs are representative of the type of 78-card pack from which the Minchiate pack was derived, there are two possibilities. The sequence may have continued down from 8 to 3 as in the Minchiate pack, with 4 and 3 as the two Emperors, and then have had two corresponding Empresses as nos. 2 and 1, and, below them, an unnumbered Bagatto. Alternatively, it may have run from 8 down to 1 exactly as in the Minchiate pack, the Bagatto thus being numbered 1, and have had some unnumbered card ranking below the Bagatto like the *Miseria* of the Tarocco Siciliano. Of these two possibilities, the former seems a little more likely; but yet others are thinkable, and it would throw great light on the history of the Italian Tarocco pack in the seventeenth century if a complete Orfeo pack were to be discovered.

In orders of types B and C, one of the Virtues – Justice in type B and Temperance in type C – is promoted higher than Death, with the result that, when all the trumps are numbered in sequence from the Bagatto up, Death comes out as no. 13, without the necessity for any special device to secure this result. In consequence, we never find a trump sequence of either of these types that leaves the Bagatto unnumbered and starts the numbering with the next card. It is for this reason that it has been possible to classify the incomplete Rouen set as exemplifying type B. In the Rouen pack, the Star is numbered 16. If the pack is at all like others that are known, there are only two possible explanations of this. Either

only four cards rank above the Star, in which case the numbering must start with the card above the Bagatto; or five cards rank above the Star, and, in that case, one of them must be Justice. The former possibility seems, in the Rouen pack, to be ruled out by the fact that the Pope and Emperor are numbered 5 and 4 respectively.

We have now to enquire in which areas the different orders were observed; and we must use whatever clues we can extract from the four sets of late fifteenth-century wood-block printed sheets for popular Tarot packs, numbered (21) to (24) in Chapter 4. Just as there is a temptation to say, at first glance, that there was no fixed order for the trumps in Italy before the eighteenth century, so there is the parallel temptation to say that no standard pattern was adopted for the Tarot pack, because, among the early cards that survive, one can scarcely find two sets exhibiting the same type of design. This temptation is equally to be resisted. We have seen it to be a universal law, applying to Indian and Chinese cards as much as to European ones, that in any locality any specific type of playing-card pack very rapidly assumes a stereotyped design to which all cardmakers conform, for the simple reason that players need to be able to recognise each card at a glance. There is no ground whatever to suppose that the Tarot pack was any exception to this rule. The variations in design that we can observe amongst surviving cards are to be explained in the same way as those between different orders of the trumps subjects, namely as representing different standard patterns used in different regions. This does not, of course, apply to the hand-painted packs, which were luxury items, nor to obviously non-standard packs such as the Rouen one or the Sola-Busca *tarocchi*: but, though we can never with certainty identify a design as a standard pattern when we have only one example of it, it is highly probable that each of our four sets of sheets (21) to (24) exemplifies one of the standard patterns in use towards the end of the fifteenth century in some particular locality. We must therefore investigate whether it is possible to identify the areas in which those standard patterns were used, simultaneously with our enquiry into the regional associations of the various trump orders.

The easiest set of sheets with which to start is the pair divided between the École des Beaux Arts and the Rothschild Collection (no. 23).

Detlef Hoffmann describes these as Minchiate cards, and W.L. Schreiber, presumably with the same idea in mind, assigns them to Florence; Stuart Kaplan characteristically hedges his bet, describing them as 'Tarot or Minchiate cards'.[15] Hoffmann mentions, only to reject, an identification of them by Sylvia Mann as Tarocchino cards; but a comparison between them and a modern Tarocco Bolognese pack will at once bear her out, revealing striking correspondences in design. If, instead, the comparison is made with the seventeenth-century standard single-ended Tarocco Bolognese in the Bibliothèque Nationale, the designs will be found to tally in almost every detail; the one exception is the Devil, the design of which on the Rothschild sheet is completely different from that of the later Tarocco Bolognese. The resemblance between the seventeenth-century pack and set no. (23) is overwhelmingly close in the cases of the Angel, the World, the Sun, the Moon, the Star, the Tower, the Hermit and the Chariot; note particularly the rayed arcs which appear in the upper corners of several cards in both packs. Death in the later pack faces the opposite way, but is otherwise similar, down to the band at the top of the card, save for the position of the horse's head. The direction of motion of the Wheel, and a few other details, differ in the later card, but they are still fairly similar. The arms of the Traitor or Hanged Man of the later pack differ from those of the earlier one in being bound behind him, instead of hanging down grasping money bags. It is only in the design of this last card in set no. (23) that there is any similarity with Minchiate cards, whereas, on the eight cards singled out above, detail after detail corresponds exactly with the Bolognese cards. This is not, indeed, to endorse Miss Mann's characterisation of these as Tarocchino cards, since the use of this term presupposes that the pack had already been shortened to 62 cards, and this, of course, we cannot judge from twelve surviving trumps; on the whole, it is probable that the shortening had not yet taken place. But we can confidently assign set (23) to Bologna, and conclude that the standard pattern used there from the seventeenth century to the present

day was already in existence by the end of the fifteenth century. It will be recalled that the single sixteenth-century unnumbered Devil card by Agnolo Hebreo in the British Museum (no. 27 above) resembles that on the Rothschild sheet, and is therefore presumably also to be assigned to Bologna: the change in the design of this card must have occurred between the mid-sixteenth and the mid-seventeenth century.

The next in order of difficulty is the Rosenwald set (no. 22 of Chapter 4). This is certainly not a Minchiate pack, since it has only twenty-one trumps. But, although the Swords are curved, it has several Minchiate characteristics: (i) the *Cavalli*, in all four suits, are centaurs, like those in Swords and Batons in the Minchiate pack; (ii) the lowest court figures in Cups and Coins are Maids, while those in Swords and Batons are Jacks; and (iii) the Kings in Swords and Batons wear short tunics, those in Cups and Coins long robes. It is true that there is no close relation between the designs for the trump cards and the corresponding ones of the Minchiate pack, save for a noticeable similarity in the case of the Hermit and the Hanged Man; but the order of the trumps is of type A, nearly, though not quite, corresponding to that of the Minchiate trumps when the twenty additional ones are removed (the positions of Fortitude and Justice, and, apparently, those of the Chariot and the Wheel, are reversed). It therefore seems probable that the set represents an early form of that standard pattern for the Tarot pack on which the Minchiate designs were later based, or some closely related pattern. The Rosenwald sheets are thus very likely to have been made in Florence (or possibly in some other city of Tuscany such as Pistoia).[16]

The type A orders are associated with Florence (by the Minchiate and Orfeo packs, and, on the basis of its resemblance to the former, by the Rosenwald one); with Rome (by the alla Colonna pack, which was certainly made there, and also by the Minchiate pack, which was

---

[15] D. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 66; W.L. Schreiber, *Die ältesten Spielkarten*, Strasbourg, 1937, p. 104; S.R. Kaplan, op. cit., pp. 128-9.

[16] The statutes of Pistoia exempt *triumphi* and a game called *la diricta* from the general prohibition on card games (*Statuta Pistoriensium libri septem*, Florence, 1579, Lib. V, rubrica LX, p. 152). Whether the word *triumphi* refers to Tarot or to a game with the regular pack is unclear. 1579 is very late for the use of the word in the former sense, but the statute may be much older than the collection; it is repeated, word for word, in the *Leges Municipales Pistoriensium nuper mandante serenissimo Cosmo III Magno Duce*, Florence, 1682, p. 210.

popular there, though it originated in Florence); with Sicily; and of course with Bologna. The Charles VI and Catania packs were probably made in Ferrara, but this does not help us, since in both cases the numbering was added later, presumably by an owner of the cards, and we do not know their early history. The Charles VI numbering does show, however, that type A orders go back to the fifteenth century, and the Rosenwald pack takes us back to the same date (or possibly a little later, since it could be from the early years of the sixteenth century). We know by documentary evidence that Tarot cards were in use in Bologna in 1459; of course, we do not know what order was there observed for the trump cards at that date, but, in view of the intense conservatism of Bolognese players, it seems more probable than not that it was already of type A. Type A thus had an early origin; as shown by the alla Colonna and Orfeo packs, it lasted through the seventeenth century, and survives, in the Tarocco Bolognese and the Tarocco Siciliano, down to the present day. The Sicilian pack provides further evidence that type A orders were observed in Rome, since it was probably from Rome that the 78-card pack was introduced into Sicily in 1663, together with the Minchiate pack. It may not have been until the later fifteenth century that the game of Tarot reached Florence, and it was almost certainly from there that both Minchiate and the 78-card game travelled to Rome, probably some time in the course of the sixteenth century. Florence is thus likely to have been the place of ultimate origin of all those type A orders other than that observed in Bologna (which, as noted, differs from the others in placing the Chariot below the Virtues). Although we have no direct evidence to this effect, it is also probable that some type A order travelled to Piedmont by at least the seventeenth century; on no other hypothesis is it intelligible that, after the reintroduction of the 78-card pack from France, Piedmontese players should have insisted on treating the Angel as ranking higher than the World.

We have now to consider the orders of type B. In the only other set of early popular Tarot cards in which the trumps are numbered, the sheets at the Metropolitan Museum (no. 21 in Chapter 4), the order is of type B. This is the only set of early Tarot cards that has stylistic affinities to any surviving regular cards. There are two sheets (I-1009 and I-1010) in the Cary Collection at Yale

University, evidently for the same pack, no cards being duplicated on the two sheets. In an article about them written in 1939,[17] Cary illustrated them, together with other copies from the Magyar Nemzeti Museum in Budapest, which I have been told are no longer there, and of which he stated that duplicates (which I have not seen) were sold to the Metropolitan Museum in New York in 1922. By comparison of Cary's sheets and those at Budapest, it can be seen that together they made up a complete regular pack of 48 cards (that is to say, without the 10s). The three sheets of the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack include no numeral cards of any of the suits, but they have three Kings, three Queens, all four *Cavalli* and two Jacks. The Kings from the two packs are highly similar, though not identical: in both they wear short tunics and sit beneath arches. The *Cavallo* of Batons (not quite complete in the Budapest sheet) appears to be identical in the two packs, a rather curious design in which the mounted knight holds the open-mouthed head of some animal. The *Cavallo* of Coins is quite different: on the Budapest sheet, the knight appears to be riding an ostrich, whereas, in the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack, he is mounted more conventionally on a horse, and holds one coin while another is at his horse's feet. Not enough of the other two *Cavalli* on the Cary/Budapest sheets can be seen to be sure how far they resemble the Metropolitan Museum ones. The Jack of Cups on the Cary sheet is identical with that in the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack: he is drinking from a cup held in his left hand, and carries a pipe in his right hand. The Jacks of Swords in the two packs are, however, quite unlike: that on the Cary sheet is in the act of sheathing his sword, while the Metropolitan Museum one bears his upright.

Other early Italian cards survive having close affinities with these two packs. In the Benaki Museum at Athens there is a 3 of Cups identical with that shown on I-1010, and therefore probably from an identical pack; it appears to have been discovered in Egypt, and hence to be from an Italian pack exported there during the Mamlūk period.[18] Also in the Cary Collection is

[17] Melbert B. Cary, Jr., 'A stencil sheet of playing cards of the late 15th century with two related uncut sheets of cards', *The Print Collectors' Quarterly*, vol. 26, 1939, pp. 392-423.

[18] See M. Dummett, 'A note on some fragments in the Benaki Museum', *Art and Archaeology Research Papers (AARP)*, no. 4, December 1973, pp. 93-9.

another sheet (I-1008), discussed by Cary in his 1939 article, and again with another copy then in Budapest and with a duplicate in the Metropolitan Museum. This is not a sheet for the same pack, the sizes of the cards being different, and the sword on the Ace of Swords being held by a lion instead of by a human hand as on I-1010; but there are close similarities. I-1008 shows only numeral cards, of Swords and Batons, and includes 10s of both suits. Finally, there are four sheets, all for the same pack, in the Fournier Museum in Vitoria (no. 1 in the Italian section of the catalogue). Although a few cards are damaged, they together make up a virtually complete regular pack, again of only 48 cards. The Kings are again highly similar both to those on I-1009 and to those in the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack, without being identical with either; the Jacks and *Cavalli* bear no resemblance to those of the other two packs; the Ace of Swords seems to be identical with that on I-1010, and those of Batons and Cups highly similar.

There are two distinctive features on the numeral cards of Swords and Batons in all these packs, save for the Metropolitan Museum Tarot pack, of which, as remarked, no numeral cards survive. In all three of the other packs, the Swords, though curved (save for the odd straight one) and mostly extending the length of the card, are arranged so as not to intersect, being concave towards the nearest edge of the card; on the higher-numbered cards, one or more swords are often placed horizontally at top or bottom. On I-1008 and in the Fournier pack, the swords are encircled by a crown; on I-1010, they are tied together by a scarf. In all three packs, the numeral cards of the Batons suit bear a scroll on which is written in full the number of the card. The pack in the Fournier Museum is dated 1462 in the first edition of the catalogue, but this is presumably due to a misreading of the scroll on the 2 of Batons, which should probably be read *duobs*: on I-1008 the form used is *duobs*, and on I-1009 *duos*. A safer dating would seem to be 1490-1510.

The similarities between all four packs, including the Tarot pack at the Metropolitan Museum, imply an origin from the same locality; and the use of identical designs for some of the cards in different packs must surely indicate that they all came from the same studio, one employing a selection of alternative designs for

the court cards and Aces. In his article, Cary proposes Venice as the place of origin of the three sheets he is discussing. He quotes the Budapest museum as describing their copies as Venetian, and cites two authorities on prints, Campbell Dodgson and Franz Schubert, as concurring with his attribution of them to Venice; the catalogue of the Fournier Museum also assigns the pack there to Venice. The only reason given for this attribution by any of these writers is, however, one advanced by Cary himself, namely that the form *diexe* used for the word 'ten' on the 10 of Batons of I-1008 belongs to the Venetian dialect, the modern Venetian form, in use at least by the sixteenth century, being *diese*. Though linguistic evidence of this kind is perfectly valid, it would be pleasant to have a broader basis for the attribution, especially as some of the linguistic forms used seem distinctly odd (one cannot in general expect very accurate spelling from cardmakers). In default of any other evidence, however, we may resonably fall in with the prevailing opinion, and agree in regarding all these packs as Venetian; it is very plausible that the pack exported to Egypt, from which the Benaki card comes, should have been made in Venice.

We may thus tentatively assign the Metropolitan Museum pack, no. (21), to Venice, and regard it as exemplifying, if not exactly a standard pattern, at least a general style of Tarot pack in use there at the end of the fifteenth century. There is a curiously persistent tradition in the literature on playing cards of referring to 78-card Italian Tarot packs as 'Venetian Tarots', as distinguished from Bolognese Tarots and 'Florentine Tarots', i.e. Minchiate packs; often the term 'Venetian Tarots' is applied even to packs made in or after the eighteenth century with designs derived from the Tarot de Marseille.[19] Venice is definitely not among the places in which the game of Tarot was played after its reintroduction from France in the eighteenth century, and there is no clear evidence

[19] The latest to follow this tradition is Mr Stuart R. Kaplan, op. cit. On p. 49, under the heading 'Tarocchi of Venice', he speaks, rather oddly, of 'the so-called Tarocchi of Venice or Lombard pack ... more commonly known as Piedmontese tarot', and illustrates this type on p. 48 with a pack in the Fournier Museum made in Gorizia, captioning it 'Piedmontese or Tarocchi of Venice Cards'. The pack is no. 12 in the Italian section of the Fournier catalogue, where it is also described as 'tarocchi de Venecia' and assigned the

that it was ever very popular there in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, so the tradition of speaking of 'Venetian Tarots' is a thoroughly misleading one; in the Metropolitan Museum sheets we have the one example of a popular pack that may plausibly be described as a Venetian Tarot.

We have now established one tentative association of the type B orders, namely with Venice. This is corroborated by the Rouen pack, which also has the trumps arranged in a type B order, and has also been associated with Venice.[20] There remain the three literary references. Unfortunately, I know no way of assigning a geographical origin to the Steele MS. volume of sermons. Tomaso Garzoni's *Piazza Universale* was published in Venice, but that is not very significant, since Venice was a great publishing centre. He himself, though he studied law at Ferrara and Siena before joining the Lateran Congregation in 1566, was a native of Bagnacavallo, near Ravenna, and also died there. As for the Bertoni *tarocchi appropriati*, they relate to the ladies of the court of Ferrara. Ferrara was never within the Venetian dominions, though it was very close to their border; but the Sola-Busca *tarocchi*, made by a Ferrarese artist but dated from the foundation of the city of Venice, testify to a link between the traditions of Tarot play in the two cities. Ferrara was, of course, one of the principal centres where the game of Tarot was played in the early period, and very likely the birthplace of the game; the Bertoni poem provides incontrovertible evidence that the type B order prevailed there. It seems quite possible, therefore, that the type of design exemplified by the Metropolitan Museum sheets, which we have assigned to Venice, was equally characteristic of Ferrara; indeed, we should keep open the possibility that those sheets are not from Venice but from Ferrara. In any case, it seems safe to assign type B orders to Venice as well as to

Ferrara, and they probably prevailed in the whole of Emilia except for the city of Bologna. On the evidence of the Steele sermon, type B orders go back to at least about 1470-80; since they are associated with Ferrara, they quite possibly go back to the original invention of the Tarot pack. On the evidence of Garzoni's book, they lasted until at least the late sixteenth century.

That leaves us with the type C order and the Cary *tarocchi* sheet, no. (24) of Chapter 4. Susio's poem, which is our only source for type C orders in Italy, concerned the ladies of the court of Pavia.[21] This city was in the dominions of both the Visconti and Sforza dukes of Milan, who styled themselves Princes of Pavia and for whom it was a second capital; it contains a great Visconti castle, begun by Galeazzo II and completed by Giangaleazzo Visconti, who also founded the Carthusian monastery near Pavia and began the building of Pavia's Cathedral, and was the first to bear the title of Duke of Milan. We may therefore reasonably assume that it was a type C order which prevailed not only at Pavia but at Milan, the second great early centre, after Ferrara, for the game of Tarot. Now despite the variations that occurred, all the trump orderings used by French and Swiss cardmakers were of type C. If we had no evidence that an order of this type was ever used in Italy before the eighteenth century, we should most naturally infer that it was invented in France or Switzerland. But, as it is, we are forced to conclude that either the French or the Swiss, or both independently, picked it up from Italy. Even if we did not know of Viévil's pack, the occurrence in both Susio's trump order and in the Tarot de Marseille of the intrinsically rather implausible placing of Temperance between Death and the Devil would seem unlikely to be a coincidence. Indeed, this is another case in which a conjecture made in the original version of this book received additional confirmation while it was in proof: for the almost exact agreement between Viévil's trump order and that given by

---

date 1650; Kaplan more cautiously says 'circa late 17th to mid-18th century'. It has inscriptions in French, and represents that adaptation of the Tarot de Marseille used in Lombardy, but made in a wide range of areas, different from the adaptation characteristic of Piedmont; it can hardly be earlier than 1740.

[20] See Pompeo Molmenti, *La Storia di Venezia nella vita privata*, vol. II, Bergamo, 1906, p. 525. Francesco Novati, on p. 19, fn. 1, of the first of his articles cited in footnote 22, expresses the same opinion. How well founded it is, I am not sure.

[21] In my earlier discussion of this subject, 'The Order of the Tarot Trumps', *Journal of the Playing-Card Society*, vol. II, no. 3, February 1974, pp. 1-17, no. 4, May 1974, pp. 33-50, I made the mistake, for which I cannot now account, of saying that the Susio poem was about the ladies of the court of Mantua. S.R. Kaplan, op. cit., pp. 30, 373, also cites Susio's poem, though he gives no reference, and also makes the same error; possibly mine was the source of his.

Susio, presumably used in Milan in the sixteenth century, converts a plausible hypothesis into a certainty. The modification of the Milanese order which resulted in that used in the Tarot de Marseille had obviously occurred by the mid-sixteenth century, without gaining universal acceptance in France for another hundred years: whether it originated in France, in Switzerland or even in Milan it is hard to judge.

If the French and Swiss did pick up the type C order in Italy, by far the likeliest place for them to have done so is Milan. Charles VIII of France invaded Italy in 1494, originally on the invitation of Lodovico Sforza (il Moro), Duke of Milan. Louis XII, the grandson of Valentina Visconti, claimed Milan by right of succession, and launched a second invasion in 1499; the city was then under French rule until 1512, when Louis was defeated at Novara by an alliance which included the Swiss. Up to 1515, when Francis I secured their exclusive services, Swiss mercenaries played a prominent role in these wars; and from 1512 to 1515, Duke Massimiliano Sforza was maintained in power by Swiss arms. In 1515 the French, under Francis I, again invaded Italy, defeated the Swiss at Marignano, and once more occupied Milan until 1522. Especially during the reign of Francis I (1515-1547), there was a great vogue in France, centring upon Lyons, for Italian culture. The period of the French incursions into Italy, from 1494 to 1525, may therefore well have been the time when the game of Tarot first entered France. It may have reached Switzerland independently in the same period, for, as we saw in Chapter 10, certain details of Swiss Tarot play suggest a direct derivation of the game from Italy. If this is true, of France alone or of both France and Switzerland, it must surely have been a Milanese style of Tarot game, and a Milanese version of the Tarot pack, that were adopted; with them would naturally go the order of the trumps observed in Milan. If the game of *triumphe* played by Duke René II of Lorraine in 1496 were truly one played with the Tarot pack, his knowledge of the game may have been due to his contact with the Swiss, with whose help he had achieved his great victory in 1477 outside the walls of Nancy against Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, who was killed in the battle. Even if this is so, the adoption in the sixteenth century of the French version *tarots* of the new term *tarocchi* argues a continued contact with Italy in the domain of card play as in other spheres.

On this theory, then, a type C trump order, and, specifically, that given by Susio, was in use in Milan; and it was from Milan that the French, and probably the Swiss, first learned the game of Tarot. They must, therefore, originally have used whatever type of design was standard in Milan: but we cannot immediately deduce what this was, since, as we saw in Chapter 9, there were two distinct traditions of design for the Tarot pack in the French-speaking lands, one culminating in the Belgian Tarot and the other in the Tarot de Marseille. We have, however, still to determine the geographical origin of the sheet in the Cary collection (no. 24). After what has gone before, this affords us very little difficulty, because of the close resemblance of certain of the cards, despite their lack of numerals or other inscriptions, to those of the Tarot de Marseille. Specifically, the Sun (of which the left-hand part is missing) is, so far as can be seen, exactly like its Tarot de Marseille counterpart; a small naked boy is to be seen at the bottom of the card, the sun has a face and rays and sheds the characteristic Tarot de Marseille droplets. The Chariot, incomplete at the top, is likewise, so far as can be seen, exactly like that of the Tarot de Marseille. The Moon resembles the Tarot de Marseille one, save that there are no dogs, and the buildings are much smaller: there is the same pool with a lobster or crab in it in the foreground. The Tower again has a close similarity to the Tarot de Marseille *Maison Dieu*: round thunderbolts are falling about a round, bricked tower, though no lightning is apparent. The Star resembles the Tarot de Marseille one in general conception, though not in detail: a very large star, surrounded by four smaller ones, shines on a naked girl pouring water into a stream. The Emperor has the same general pose and appearance as in the Tarot de Marseille, though the positions of his shield and sceptre are different. The Bagatto has the same posture as the Tarot de Marseille one, though he does not face in the same direction, and his hat and table are differently shaped. The Love card, of which only the lower half survives, is particularly interesting. Only two figures can be seen, corresponding perhaps to the left-hand and central figures of the Tarot de Marseille card: but they are highly reminiscent of the couple on the corresponding card in the Visconti di

Modrone pack (no. 1 in Chapter 4). The Wheel of Fortune, another card whose top half is missing, has the same orientation, and the same handle, as in the Tarot de Marseille; and the Empress, though again with shield and sceptre reversed, has the same chair-back that, on several cards, keeps threatening, in Tarot de Marseille derivatives, to turn into a pair of wings. Not much can be seen of the Fool, save that, as in the Tarot de Marseille, he is striding off to the right, a staff over his shoulder; no dog is to be seen, however. The two suit cards, the 7 and 8 (or 9) of Batons, are exactly like those of the Tarot de Marseille, save for the lack of inscribed numerals; the Batons have just the same flat appearance, with widened ends, found both in the Tarot de Marseille and in Viévil's pack. Other cards, however, have little or no similarity to their Tarot de Marseille counterparts: Temperance, the Devil, Fortitude and the Popess (on this sheet, a Bishopess); of the Pope, not enough can be seen to be sure.

These resemblances cannot possibly be coincidence: it is evident that the French cardmakers borrowed these designs, which thus became ancestral to the Tarot de Marseille pattern. It follows that the origin of the Tarot de Marseille goes right back to the first introduction of the Tarot pack into France, and perhaps also into Switzerland, around the beginning of the sixteenth century. It also follows that we can firmly identify the Cary sheet as being from Milan, and hence as exemplifying the standard pattern employed in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century for popular Tarot packs in the city from which came the finest of the early hand-painted cards; that city where, as we have argued, the French and probably also the Swiss first encountered the game of Tarot and took it back with them to their home countries. This hypothesis fits well with the fact that the trumps on the Cary sheet are unnumbered. It was stated earlier that, of all the literary references, only the Steele sermon assigns numbers to the trumps, but this was not strictly accurate: the lines of the Susio poem are also numbered, but in the reverse order, the World being numbered 1, the Angel 2 and so on. This is the most explicit testimony possible to the fact that the trumps of the pack in which this type C order was used were *not* numbered: if they had been, it is inconceivable that the poem could have given the numbering in the reverse order. In whichever form of pack

the ordering of the trumps given by Susio was employed, the players accustomed to play with it must have had to memorise the trump sequence, just as the Bolognese ones had to do. Because of the affinities which both the trump order and the designs of the Cary sheet have to the cards used in France, it is highly probable that the kind of pack for which the type C order was used was that of which the Cary sheet is an instance.

These conclusions are corroborated by the set of six Tarot cards (no. 29 above) found at the Castello Sforzesco in Milan during the restoration work of 1908, and by others found there at the same time; again, these were not known to me in detail until this book was in proof, and provided strong confirmation of the hypotheses set out above concerning Milan. The cards found at the Castello were cursorily described by Francesco Novati in two articles of 1908.[22] His datings tend to be uniformly too early. He considered all the cards to date from the fifteenth, sixteenth or seventeenth century, whereas some demonstrably exemplify the eighteenth-century Lombard variation on the Tarot de Marseille. One such example is a set of five cards (Cavallo of Swords, torn at the bottom, 5 and 7 of Coins, and 6 and 8 of Swords, the last four all having Roman numerals at the sides) made by the cardmaker who used the trade-name 'Al Soldato' and operated in Bologna during the eighteenth century. Another is a Cavallo of Batons, bearing a legible French inscription at the bottom. There is also a set of three cards, which appear to have been trimmed at top and bottom, and are probably from a French Tarot de Marseille pack of the Revolutionary period: they consist of the Sun, numbered XVIIII, the lower inscription having been trimmed off, the Cavalier of Cups, of which the same is true, and the 4 of Swords, with Roman numerals at the sides. There are also a 10 of Coins, with the trade-name 'Al Leone' on the back, and a 5 of Cups, with the trade-name 'Al Mondo'; both these names signify other Bolognese cardmakers of the eighteenth century.

However, besides the set of six *tarocchi* classified as no. (29) above, there are also other

[22] Francesco Novati, 'Carte da giuoco dei secoli XV, XVI e XVII rinvenute nel Castello Sforzesco', *Bullettino dei civici musei artistico ed archeologico di Milano*, anno III, num. 3, 1908, pp. 17-20, and 'Per la storia delle carte da giuoco in Italia: appunti', *Il Libro e la Stampa*, anno II (n.s.), 1908, pp. 54-69; see pp. 65ff.

cards evidently dating from before the eighteenth century, none of which we have any reason to regard as being from a Tarot pack. Just as in Bologna the same standard pattern was used for the regular Primiera pack and for the suit cards of the Tarocco pack, so the same may well have been true in Milan. One of these earlier cards is a 5 of Batons, exhibiting the usual flat shape, with widened ends, of Tarot de Marseille Batons, but without numerals, but only floral decoration, at the sides. Another is a much damaged Cavallo (of Swords?), not coinciding in design with any known standard Tarot pattern. This may come from the same pack as the 5 of Batons, but from both the back design has peeled off; they may be of the sixteenth or seventeenth century. A set of nineteen cards, some very fragmentary, all of the same size (102 x 69 mm.) and presumably by the same maker, though not from the same pack, is assigned by Novati to sixteenth-century Venice. The back of each card depicts a classical deity, whose name is inscribed on a scroll; nine different deities appear on different cards. Each back design is surrounded by a wide border with lozenge-shaped dots, which fold over to form a border for the face of the card.[23] Of these, fourteen are numeral cards, of all four suits; in every case, they tally precisely in design with the corresponding cards of the Tarot de Marseille, save that they lack Roman numerals at the sides. The remaining five, all fragmentary, are court cards. They are: the top half of a King (of Batons?), the back showing SATURNO; the top half of a Jack (of Coins?) and the bottom half of a Jack (of Cups?), both backs showing PROSERPINA; and the top half of a Cavallo of Cups and the bottom half of a Jack of uncertain suit, both backs showing IOVE. These court cards do not show the same close correspondence with Tarot de Marseille designs. In particular, the Cavallo of Cups holds in his left hand a Cup shaped like that on the Tarot de Marseille Jack of that suit, instead of the Spanish-style Cup held in the right hand of the Cavalier in the Tarot de Marseille; while the King, who is bearded, holds, with his left hand, a Baton (or sceptre) over his left shoulder. Nevertheless, the Jack of which we have the top half wears the celebrated wide-brimmed hat found in the Tarot de Marseille on

the Jacks of Coins and Swords and the Cavalier of Batons; and the King likewise wears the same hat surmounted by a crown, as do all four Kings in the Tarot de Marseille. These nineteen cards, from nine distinct packs, could be either of the sixteenth or of the seventeenth century. There seems no reason, however, to regard them as Venetian rather than Milanese; Swords and Batons on the numeral cards of the Venetian standard pattern, and on older cards assignable to Venice, have a different shape from those found here.

One of the oldest cards found at the Castello is a King of Cups of which, again, the top half is missing. The posture of the King resembles that of the King of Coins in the supposedly Spanish fifteenth-century pack which, in Chapter 2, we tentatively assigned to Naples, and, more generally, of several early German Kings; it may be of the early sixteenth or even of the fifteenth century. The most interesting of all the cards found at the Castello is a 2 of Coins which bears the scroll in the shape of an inverted S which, in Chapter 9, we noted as always occurring (sometimes not inverted) in Tarot de Marseille packs, and also in the pack of Jacques Viévil. As on the French cards, the scroll is inscribed with the maker's name and the date; the inscription reads PAVLINVS [DE] CASTELETO FECIT 1499. Novati cites documentary evidence of the presence in Milan in 1508 and 1513 of a cardmaker by the name of Paolino di Castelletto. There is no reason to regard Paolino's 2 of Coins, any more than the other cards just discussed, as having belonged to a Tarot pack: it nevertheless provides good evidence that a distinctive feature of French and Swiss Tarot card design was borrowed from Milan. The S-shaped feature is found to this day on the 2 of Coins in certain standard patterns for the Italian-suited regular pack, the Primiera Bolognese and Brescia patterns; in these however, it no longer has the character of a scroll; and does not bear the maker's name.

We have no pre-eighteenth-century Milanese example of the 2 of Cups, which is so distinctive of French Tarot packs, including Viévil's and de Hautot's as well as the Tarot de Marseille. But the curious and prominent feature of the two dragon-heads on the French versions of the card provide a particular reason for considering the design to have been derived from some very early prototype. As first remarked by Mr Jan

---

[23] Compare the backs of seventeenth-century Italian cards from the Correr Museum, Venice, shown by Hoffmann, op. cit., as plate 7b.

Bauwens, these dragon-heads have an extraordinary similarity to the dragon-heads in which certain of the suit-signs terminate on some cards of the Polo-Sticks suit in the Istanbul Mamlūk pack.[24] It looks as if we had here a detail, faithfully copied for centuries, that had originally been borrowed from Islamic cards; if so, the design of at least that particular card must go back to a period when Islamic cards were familiar to European players or cardmakers. This, too, fits very well with our conclusion that the designs on which the Tarot de Marseille was based were ones used in Milan, the birthplace of that Valentina Visconti whose inventory, upon her death in 1408, had listed *ung jeu de quartes sarrasines* along with *unes quartes de Lombardie*.[25]

One's first impression, looking at the various cards found at the Castello Sforzesco together, is of their uniformity of style. It would be a great mistake to suspect them for this reason of all dating from after 1700. The 2 of Coins by Paolino proves incontrovertibly that some are much older than that; and there is a clear criterion of

distinction between post- and pre-eighteenth-century cards, the presence or absence of numerals on the numeral cards of the suits, and of names on the trumps and court cards. By this criterion, the set of six *tarocchi* is to be assigned to the earlier category, probably to the seventeenth century. What the cards found at the Castello together demonstrate is the absolute constancy of the Milanese designs for the numeral cards of the Italian-suited pack, and the equal constancy of the same designs as borrowed by the French cardmakers and employed in the Tarot de Marseille. If you ignore the inscription on Paolino's 2 of Coins, you might think that you were looking at an eighteenth-century card made in Marseilles. In the same way, apart from the absence of the Roman numerals at the sides, the numeral cards from the set of six *tarocchi*, those with classical deities on the backs, and the odd 5 of Batons are virtually indistinguishable from the eighteenth-century Lombard pattern. This may, at first sight, raise a doubt whether our original hypothesis, stated in Chapter 8, was after all correct, namely that the Lombard variant on the Tarot de Marseille signalised the reintroduction of the game of Tarot into Lombardy after a period in which it had been defunct there. Perhaps, we may now think, the Lombard pattern was a direct continuation of the standard pattern always used in Lombardy for Tarot cards, and for Italian-suited ones generally, and represented no more radical a change than a new vogue for putting names on the trump and court cards and numerals on the numeral cards. But reflection shows that we have no reason to doubt our original hypothesis. Whether that hypothesis is sound or unsound, the cards found at the Castello prove conclusively that the Tarot de Marseille designs for the numeral cards had faithfully preserved the Milanese prototypes on which they must have been modelled in the early sixteenth century, and that these same designs remained unchanged in Milan itself. Given this, a close resemblance between those made in pre-eighteenth-century Milan and those of the later Lombard pattern is precisely what we should expect, even if our hypothesis is true; that we find just such a resemblance is therefore no argument against that hypothesis. Our original ground for the hypothesis remains as suasive as ever, namely that, if inscriptions had been added to an existing pattern for a pack used to play a living game, they would have been in Italian; the fact

---

[24] Jan Bauwens, *Mulūk wa Nuwwāb*, Aurelia Books, Leuven (Louvain), 1972, booklet issued with a reproduction of the Istanbul Mamlūk pack, pp. 36-7, figs. 8-11. (It should be noted that the reproduction pack is not a faithful copy of the original, but involves a good deal of 'reconstruction', to a large extent unsound: see the review by me in the *Journal of the Playing-Card Society*, vol. II, no. 2, November 1973, pp. 15-26. This does not, of course, affect the present point, which is a very interesting one.)

[25] F.M. Graves, *Deux inventaires de la Maison d'Orléans*, Paris, 1926, pp. 49, 134; see Chapter 3. On p. 84 it was strongly argued that the references to *triumphe* of 1482 and 1496 must relate to Tarot games. Such a hypothesis would contradict the idea that Tarot first entered France during the French occupation of Milan, since, as explained in footnote 2 to Chapter 9, the 1482 reference must concern a game played in France proper. But there is no difficulty in supposing the game to have spread to different parts of France at different times and by different routes; possibly it was the non-Milanese ancestor of the Paris/Rouen pattern that was the earlier arrival, and would have been used in 1482. If the game of 1482 was that played with the regular pack, the only reasonable hypothesis is that it also had an Italian origin, in which case an Italian game, involving trumps but played with the regular pack and known as *trionfi*, must have been in existence well before the end of the fifteenth century, and even longer before the earliest recorded use, in 1516, of the term *tarocchi*; if so, the reference to *triumphi* cited by W.L. Schreiber from the statutes of Bergamo, Brescia, Salo and Reggio nell'Emilia may not have been to Tarot games. On balance, this does not seem to me very likely; but without doubt the 1482 reference generates perplexity. An examination of the document at the Archives Nationales might yield further clues.

that, for several decades, they remained in French clearly indicates that the Tarot de Marseille designs were being introduced from France; and that can have happened only if the indigenous tradition had, however little time before, died out. What the Cary sheet and the Castello Sforzesco cards make clear is that, in adopting a form of pack derived from the Tarot de Marseille, the players of *tarocchi* in Lombardy were welcoming home a descendant of the type of pack with which their ancestors had played, and a close relative of that used by their fathers.

How close a relative? The World card in the Castello Sforzesco set suggests that, as on the Cary sheet, the trump cards were without (visible) numerals, just as were those of the Tarocco Bolognese at that date; but the conclusion is uncertain, since there could have been numerals on all the trumps except the highest, as in the Metropolitan Museum pack. In any case, it is a presumption, though not a certainty, that the trump order was as given by Susio rather than as in the Tarot de Marseille. Indeed, were it not for the Cary sheet, we might suspect Viévil's pack, rather than the Tarot de Marseille, to preserve the Milanese tradition of design; for it will be recalled that Viévil's World resembles that of the Tarot de Marseille, and hence also the Castello Sforzesco card, much more closely than it does that of de Hautot or of the Belgian Tarot. The few pre-eighteenth-century court cards from the Castello Sforzesco show that the Milanese designs of the time were far from wholly identical with those of the Tarot de Marseille. The French cardmakers introduced Batons of Spanish type for the Cavalier and Jack of that suit, and a straight-sided Cup of Spanish type for the Jack of Cups. Probably they departed in many other respects as well from the Milanese prototypes, and the same may easily be true for the trump cards. But, at the same time, the wide-brimmed hats found in two of the court cards of the classical deities set corroborate our general conclusion that the Tarot de Marseille was of Milanese origin.

We have, then, a surprising result: the Tarot pack entered France with a pattern of design ancestral to the Tarot de Marseille but with a trump order almost identical with that of Viévil's pack. Viévil's trump order was thus not, in the first place at least, especially associated with the Paris/Rouen standard pattern. Rather, it must have been a survival from an earlier epoch:

perhaps the modified order which is found in Geoffroy's pack of 1557, in the anonymous Parisian pack and in the Tarot de Marseille existed alongside the original Milanese one for a considerable time. What, then, can have been the origin of the Paris/Rouen pattern which finished its career as the Tarot pattern proper to Belgium? It has certain particular affinities with Italian Tarot cards. The man with the compasses found on the Star appears on the Moon card in the Minchiate pack and the Tarocco Bolognese, and also in the hand-painted 'Charles VI' set (no. 4 in Chapter 4); and the woman with the distaff on the Moon card appears in the Tarocco Bolognese and the 'Charles VI' set on the Sun. There is also a resemblance between the World in de Hautot's pack and in the Belgian Tarot and the World in both the Minchiate pack and the Tarocco Bolognese, and also in the 'Charles VI' set and the Catania set (no. 7 in Chapter 4). We cannot be sure how significant this last point of affinity may be, since the Rouen and Belgian World seems to have been copied from the anonymous Parisian pack, Viévil's version being quite different. It is unlikely that any French or Belgian cardmaker would know anything about Florentine, Bolognese or Ferrarese cards. The likeliest hypothesis seems to be as follows. It has been argued that a Tarot pack with a type A order for the trumps, such as prevailed in Bologna and Florence, must, before the eighteenth century, have been in use in Piedmont. The game presumably spread there from somewhere like Bologna, Florence or Rome, just as the game of Minchiate had by the seventeenth century spread from Florence to Genoa. The designs for this former Piedmontese pack may, then, have become the original of the Paris/Rouen pattern; they could easily have passed via Savoy into France, existing French tradition being too strong to allow this type of Tarot pack to retain its type A trump order. (Possibly the employment of a shortened 62-card pack at Chambéry points to Bologna as the most likely place of origin.) On this hypothesis, therefore, the ancestor of the Belgian Tarot was this lost Piedmontese pattern. A small piece of evidence in its favour is the preservation in Savoy into the 1900s of the form *Baga* employed by Viévil to name the trump I.

The Playing-Card Society is engaged upon a definitive classification of all standard patterns that can be indubitably recognised as such, and

for this purpose assigns numbers to each pattern: thus the Tarot de Marseille is IT-1, the Tarocco Bolognese IT-2 and the Belgian Tarot IT-3, the letter I indicating an Italian-suited pattern and the letter T a Tarot pack.[26] Numbers with more than one digit indicate derivatives from the pattern whose number is found by deleting the last digit: thus the Tarot de Besançon, regarded as a modification of the Tarot de Marseille, is IT-1·4, and the romanticised nineteenth-century version, still used in Switzerland, that is its only modern descendant is IT-1·41. The Tarot de Marseille has lasted down to the present day, though now mostly used for fortune-telling. The Tarot de Besançon, which was used, though not of course exclusively, almost everywhere in Europe except Belgium and Italy, died out, save for the IT-1·41 form, in the nineteenth century.[27] Of the Italian derivatives from the Tarot de Marseille, the earliest form of the Tarocco Piemontese receives the number IT-1·2. It was subsequently modified, making it less precisely similar to the Tarot de Marseille, and replacing the French inscriptions by Italian ones; this second stage is labelled IT-1·21. A further modification resulted in the double-headed version of the Tarocco Piemontese used today, labelled IT-1·211. The Lombard pattern, whether with French or Italian inscriptions, is designated IT-1·1. In the early nineteenth century it was replaced by a romanticised version, sufficiently different to merit a distinct numeral after the decimal point, and thus designated IT-1·3, subsequently succeeded by a slightly modified double-headed version, IT-1·31. The IT-1·31 tradition, sometimes inaccurately called the Tarocchino Milanese, in its turn died out, leaving the modern Tarocco Piemontese, IT-2·11, as the sole form of 78-card pack now used in Italy. (The term *tarocchino* has

been applied to IT-1·3 because of the small size of the cards; properly it should relate only to a reduced number of cards in the pack.)

What, then, of the subsequent history of our conjectural four early Italian standard patterns? The Bolognese one presents no problems. We know the stages through which it went: the replacement of the old design for the Devil by a new one, say around 1600; the substitution of the Moors for the *Papi* in 1725; the introduction of numerals on the trumps and the change to a double-headed form in the later eighteenth century. The Metropolitan Museum pattern, which we have taken to characterise Venice and perhaps Ferrara, has a single possible surviving later exemplar, the isolated Love card in the Museo Nazionale delle Arti e Tradizioni Poplari in Rome (no. 28 above). The design is more complex than that of the corresponding card on the Metropolitan Museum sheet, of which only the top half remains. The latter shows only a Cupid in the air aiming his bow, with a man below on the left and a girl on the right. The later card has an additional *putto* in the air, and, below, an embracing couple on the left and, in front of them, two musicians, one in a feathered hat playing a viol da gamba and the other playing a lute. This could, however, be seen as a development of the earlier design: what makes it probable that it represents a descendant of the same pattern, or comes at least from a pack with a type B order, is its being numbered VIII, like the Metropolitan Museum card (as it would presumably also have been numbered in the Rouen pack and in any with the Garzoni/Bertoni version of the type B order). The Museo Nazionale card is cited by the anonymous editors of *Antiche Carte de Tarocchi* as Venetian, of the late sixteenth century; it may be as late as the seventeenth century. By Garzoni's testimony, the type B order was still known in the 1580s. It seems likely, however, that the game of Tarot suffered a general loss of popularity, in Venice and Ferrara, during the sixteenth century. The verse diatribe by Lollio, a Ferrarese author whose poem was published in a collection printed in Venice, was obviously less than half serious, like Berni's earlier derisory remarks; but it evidently indicates a decline in the esteem with which the game was regarded in the mid-sixteenth century. Probably we shall not be far wrong if we see the Venice/Ferrara pattern, and, with it, the type B order, as having died out not

---

[26] The Society issues a four-page sheet for each standard pattern, illustrating characteristic cards, giving its history and listing prominent makers past and present.

[27] The Playing-Card Society sheet on IT-1·4 says that, although 'it was not until about 1800 that any quantity of these cards were made in Besançon, ... the pattern can barely have survived the early part of the 19th century, being replaced in most areas by the French-suited Tarot packs'. This latter remark is certainly true of Germany and the Austrian Empire; but, as reported in Chapter 15, a booklet on the game first published in Besançon in 1880 still describes it as played with an Italian-suited pack; so the Tarot de Besançon probably survived in Besançon itself until the end of the century or later.

long after 1600.

From the set no. (29) of *tarocchi* found at the Castello Sforzesco, it seems likely that the Milanese pattern, of which the Cary sheet is the earliest example, survived into the seventeenth century, although the dating of that set is far from certain. The reintroduction in about 1740 of the 78-card pack in its IT-1·1 form represented a revival of an ancient tradition; but it is difficult to guess how long the interval had been during which Tarocco had no longer been played. As for the ancient Piedmontese pattern whose existence, as the ancestor of the Paris/Rouen pattern, we have conjectured, that can hardly have died out much more than thirty years before the introduction of IT-1·2, if there were to be players who still remembered that the *Angelo* used to be superior to the *Mondo*.

The Florentine pattern represented by the Rosenwald sheets had, by contrast, a very eventful history. At some time before the invention of the Minchiate pack in the first half of the sixteenth century, the pattern must have assumed a partly Portuguese type of suit-system, by changing the shape of the Swords from curved to straight. It is, presumably, this type of 78-card pack that is represented in seventeenth-century Florence by the Orfeo packs. Save for the Marchese di Villabianca, there is no known literary reference alluding to any type of Tarot game other than Minchiate played in Florence or in Rome during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Yet the Orfeo and alla Colonna packs testify to the continued existence in both cities of the 78-card pack. On Villabianca's testimony, the 78-card pack was introduced into Sicily by the Viceroy in 1663. Since the Minchiate pack was, according to him, introduced at the same time, it must have been in Florence or in Rome that the Viceroy had become acquainted with these games, and he is much more likely to have visited Rome than Florence. This is confirmed by the fact that the 78-card pack introduced into Sicily must have had a type A order, and, moreover, as we have seen, probably had 'Portuguese' suit-signs. From the alla Colonna pack, it is apparent that in Rome the Florentine type of Tarot pack had evolved into one using a fully-fledged 'Portuguese' suit-system; and it must have been a pack of this kind which was ancestral to the Tarocco Siciliano. We know, in broad outline, the later history of the Tarot pack in Sicily. The Minchiate pack died out in Sicily

during the eighteenth century, but continued to flourish in Florence until almost the end of the nineteenth, and, in Genoa, until the 1930s. As for the Portuguese or Italo-Portuguese versions of the 78-card pack, descended from the Florentine pattern, and used in Rome and Florence, we must suppose them to have become obsolete some time in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Though we have been forced to rely on a good deal of conjecture, we have been able with its help to reconstruct in outline the entire history of the Latin-suited Tarot pack, which can be illustrated by a diagram. For this diagram, the Playing-Card Society numbers for standard patterns have been supplemented by some additional ones. A zero after the decimal point may be used to indicate an ancestor of a single-digit pattern: thus the postulated Milanese pattern represented by the Cary sheet, ancestral to the Tarot de Marseille, is designated IT-1·0. The original and the later Minchiate patterns are designated IPT-1 and IPT-1·1 respectively in the P.-C.S. system, the letters IP, which refer to the suit-system, standing for 'Italo-Portuguese', while IPT-2 is used for the early version of the Tarocco Siciliano, IPT-2·1 representing the later form (from the Fortuna pack down to Modiano). It seems better to alter these numbers so as to be able to indicate the relationship with patterns for 78-card packs. Thus the Orfeo packs may be designated IPT-5, the Florentine pattern represented by the Rosenwald sheets IT-5·0, and the Minchiate patterns redesignated IPM-5 and IPM-5·1. It seems better to indicate a fully-fledged Portuguese pattern by the single letter P: if the two stages of the Tarocco Siciliano are then redesignated PT-6 and PT-6·1, we can use PT-6·0 for the alla Colonna pattern. The Rothschild/Beaux Arts sheets agree with later Tarocco Bolognese designs closely enough to justify the use for them of the straight designation IT-2, while the Venetian pattern represented by the Metropolitan Museum sheets can be called IT-4. The pack made by de Hautot in Rouen obviously exemplifies just the same pattern as the later Belgian Tarot, IT-3 in the P.-C.S. numbering; although Viévil's pack has many differences, in particular having a different trump order and including the Pope and Popess, we may use the same number for it, keeping IT-3·0 for the conjectural Piedmontese ancestor of this pattern. We thus arrive at the following code, where an asterisk denotes a number not used by the P.-C.S.:

IT-1·0* : Milanese pattern (Cary sheet and Castello Sforzesco set)
IT-1   : Tarot de Marseille
IT-1·1   : Lombard version of the Tarot de Marseille
IT-1·2   Tarocco Piemontese (early form)
IT-1·21 : Tarocco Piemontese (intermediate form)
IT-1·211: Tarocco Piemontese (modern double-headed form)
IT-1·3   : romanticised Milanese version of IT-1·1
IT-1·31 : double-headed version of IT-1·3
IT-1·4   : Tarot de Besançon
IT-1·41 : romanticised Swiss version of IT-1·4
IT-2   : Tarocco Bolognese
IT-3·0* : conjectural early Piedmontese pattern
IT-3   : Paris/Rouen pattern and Belgian Tarot
IT-4*   : Venetian/Ferrarese pattern (Metropolitan Museum sheets)
IT-5·0* : early Florentine pattern (Rosenwald sheets)
IPT-5*   : later Florentine pattern (Orfeo packs)
IPM-5*   : original Minchiate pattern (P.-C.S. number IPT-1)
IPM-5·1* : later Minchiate pattern (P.-C.S. number IPT-1·1)
PT-6·0*: Roman pattern (alla Colonna sheets)
PT-6*   : Tarocco Siciliano, early form (P.-C. S. number IPT-2)
PT-6·1*: Tarocco Siciliano, later form (P.-C. S. number IPT-2·1)

The diagram is principally concerned to show where the different patterns were *used*, rather than where they were made; thus, although Bologna cardmakers produced both Minchiate cards and Lombard pattern packs, neither is shown under Bologna because neither was used there. A solid line indicates that cards of the given type and made in or for the given area survive to us from the given period; a short line indicates a single surviving set, a longer one the existence of packs sufficiently close in date to warrant a presumption of continuous manufacture and employment. In some cases, of course, the dates are only approximate. A dotted line indicates the conjectural use of the given type of Tarot pack; the grounds for such conjectures vary in strength, and have been set out in this chapter. Where a given pattern has travelled from one area to another, this is indicated by a nearly horizontal line with an arrow; where one pattern has developed out of an earlier one which then continued to co-exist with it, this has been shown by a nearly horizontal line without an

arrow, whether the new pattern was used in the same area or another; where a pattern was replaced by a new one that had developed from it, this is shown by a small horizontal bar across the vertical line. French-suited Tarot patterns are not shown. The part of the diagram from 1700 on is not open to doubt; that before 1700 is highly conjectural. Further research may yield a different picture. The diagram will be found on the end-papers.

It may be asked which of the trump orders was the original one, that which was intended when the Tarot pack was first devised. If we knew nothing about the geographical associations of the different orders, it would be natural to guess that a type A order was the original one, for several reasons. First, it seems more intelligible that the Angel, which undoubtedly represents the Last Judgment, should be placed at the end of the sequence than in the penultimate or antepenultimate position. Secondly, save for the association of Justice with the Judgment, it seems difficult to discern any appropriateness in the scattering of the Virtues through the sequence in orders of types B and C. And thirdly, if a type A order were the original one, it would be possible to explain the invention of types B and C as devices for bringing the Death card to position 13 once the practice of numbering the trump cards had been introduced. The evidence of geographical association shows this guess unlikely to be right. Of the two possible claimants for the birthplace of the Tarot pack, Ferrara certainly observed a type B order and Milan very probably a type C order; furthermore, we saw that it is likely that, in Italy, the trumps in packs with a type C order were not numbered, so that we cannot explain the genesis of this order in the way suggested. In the present state of knowledge, the question concerning the priority of the three types of order does not seem to be a fruitful one. What the variations do strongly suggest is that there was never any very great symbolic significance in the precise order in which the trump subjects were arranged. It will be recalled that the Visconti di Modrone pack, the earliest that has survived to us, differed from all later ones in having six court cards, and thus sixteen cards altogether, in each suit, and also in containing Faith, Hope and Charity, as well as Fortitude, among its trump cards, and therefore, probably, all seven Virtues. It was suggested in Chapter 4 that it may have had as many as

twenty-four trumps, the constant factor being the 3:2 ratio of trumps to cards per suit. There is, of course, no way of being sure of its exact composition. It is possible that the Visconti di Modrone pack was no more than a freak, and that what was later the standard composition of the Tarot pack was standard from the time of its first invention. But it is also possible that the Visconti di Modrone pack represents the original form of the Tarot pack, and that the 78-card pack as we know it is the result of a modification adopted early in its history. If so, the standard set of twenty-one trumps must itself be the slightly mutilated remnant of the original, and possibly larger, set. In that case, we could not expect any ordering of the trumps in the standard set to make perfect sense; even if there was any particular symbolic intention underlying the original sequence of Tarot trumps, which there may not have been, we could expect fully to understand it only if we knew which subjects the original set contained and in what order they were arranged. It is unlikely that we ever shall.

This chapter has attempted a reconstruction, no doubt to be improved as further evidence is uncovered, of the history of the Latin-suited Tarot pack. Despite two centuries of research on playing cards, it was only very recently that this history began to be investigated. Until then, writers on playing cards were content to rely on a standard traditional account, amounting only to a static classification into types (Tarocchino, Minchiate, etc.), as if these had all come into existence on the eighth day of creation; among such types, the so-called Venetian Tarocchi formed a mere ragbag comprising all 78-card Italian Tarot packs. The reason for this failure has been the lack of any clear concept of standard patterns: without this theoretical tool, a historian cannot set aside luxury packs and other obviously non-standard ones, and hence can make only the crudest distinctions within the heterogeneity of the data that then confront him. As in other areas of the subject, such as Portuguese-suited cards, the first steps towards an analysis of the evolution of Latin-suited Tarot cards were taken by Sylvia Mann. As explained in the introduction, I have refrained from cluttering up the preceding exposition with repeated acknowledgments to her. Her contribution has, however, been so substantial that it requires more than a generalised recognition. This is particularly so for two

reasons: academics working in the field are prone to underestimate the contributions of a non-academic; and the magnitude of her contribution cannot be estimated from her published writings. Probably the most enduring monument to her work will be the Playing-Card Society's anonymous classificatory sheets, mentioned above, a project inspired, and in considerable part executed, by her. A great many of her ideas, freely offered, have been incorporated into the work of others and first expressed in print in their writings; of that process, this book contains many examples. I have been happy to be able to work in this field as a member of the school of which she is the leader.

A number of observations by her formed the basis for my own work on the subject. She first drew attention to the importance of the Orfeo packs, which had escaped the attention of everyone else, and proposed that, rather than very incomplete Minchiate packs, they were nearly complete 78-card ones. She also identified the Rothschild/Beaux Arts sheets as from what she, probably mistakenly, described as a 'Tarocchino' pack, but at any rate from Bologna. She emphasised the problem posed by the Belgian Tarot, and remarked on the affinity between certain of its cards and some of the Italian ones. She also noticed that the Tarot de Marseille was restricted to French-speaking regions, and that the Tarot de Besançon was originally used in German-speaking ones.

All these observations are, in my opinion, sound and illuminating. But the most important thesis advanced by her, concerning the Italian Tarot de Marseille-derived packs, proved more problematic. She was the first to distinguish between the two standard patterns, that ancestral to the Tarocco Piemontese (IT-1·2), restricted to Piedmont, and that with narrow cards and fold-over backs (IT1·1), made in many parts of Italy. (The ground for describing the latter as 'the Lombard pattern' rests on information from literary sources concerning where it was used, evidence which, whenever possible, ought to supplement that based on place of manufacture.) She remarked that these patterns appear to have been introduced only in the eighteenth century, and proposed that this was to be explained on the hypothesis that the 78-card pack, and the game played with it, had died out in Italy during the seventeenth century, and had been reintroduced from France.

Principally because of the French inscriptions originally used on these two patterns, I continue to view this thesis as essentially correct. Nevertheless, as first propounded, it was misleading in two respects. First, it rested on the idea that there was something describable as 'the Italian 78-card pack', and something describable as 'the Italian game with 78 cards'. In fact, there has been much more interplay between the designs of Tarot cards and the modes of play with the 78-card pack between countries other than Italy than there has ever been within Italy. The distinct traditions of design and of play evidently established before the close of the fifteenth century appear thereafter to have remained without influence on one another, and to have evolved, in so far as they did evolve, quite independently. What first made this clear was the investigation into the different trump orders. The various orders could have been established only at a date at which there were as yet no numerals on the trump cards; and, in each of the different centres, the order there observed could have been fixed only at the moment of the first introduction of the Tarot pack, since, once a trump order had been agreed on, utter confusion would have resulted among players if it were to be changed, at least so long as each trump card was identified primarily by its subject rather than by an inscribed numeral. But, even if Miss Mann's thesis, as originally stated, incorporated an error in this regard, it was she herself who prompted its correction; for, although it was I who carried out the investigation into the trump orders, it was she who saw the importance this might have and first suggested to me that I look into it.

Secondly, the thesis suggested, what I at first assumed, that no designs resembling the Tarot de Marseille were known in Italy before the eighteenth century; from this it appeared to follow that the Tarot de Marseille was a purely French invention. As explained above, this is not so at all: the Cary sheet and the Castello Sforzesco cards show that very similar designs were in use in Milan from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. It therefore appears that the Tarot de Marseille was derived from a Milanese prototype; and this conclusion weakens, though it does not destroy, the case for assuming that the introduction of the Lombard pattern occurred only after an interval during which the 78-card pack had been defunct. Moreover, the natural presumption is that the form of Tarot game played outside Italy with the 78-card pack was descended from the Milanese game. On this assumption, it ceases to be of such importance whether or not there was an interval before the adoption of the Lombard pattern: the game played after the interval would still have been, in broad outline, similar to that played before it.

In the end, therefore, it appears that Sylvia Mann's thesis rests on a slenderer base of evidence, and has less far-reaching consequences, than at first appeared. That is not to disparage the importance of the step taken by her in advancing it. For one thing, it served as a surrogate for the realisation of the independence of the four Italian traditions of Tarot play, by making what is probably to be regarded as the Milanese tradition appear as an eighteenth-century importation from abroad. For another, it was a first attempt to make sense of the very confusing evidence, which those who spoke about 'the Venetian Tarot' as a single type alongside the Tarocchino and Minchiate packs had simply declined even to try to interpret. At the present stage, the history of Tarot cards in Lombardy before the eighteenth century stands in need of further investigation. We cannot be sure that there was indeed an interval during which they were no longer used. We cannot be sure that the trump order used in the Tarot de Marseille was really a French invention, and that, before the eighteenth century, players in Lombardy remained faithful to the Susio/Viévil order. In both cases I have suggested affirmative answers; but more evidence is desirable. We do not know just how the indigenous Milanese trump designs evolved, or how close they came to be to those of the Tarot de Marseille; nor do we know whether, before 1700, Milanese players continued to use trumps without inscribed numerals. As for Piedmont, the uncertainty concerning it is greater still. We have sufficient reason to assume that the game was known there before the eighteenth century, and that there was indeed some break in continuity; but it is conceivable that this break occurred earlier, and was ended by the introduction of Milanese designs, some time before the latter were in turn replaced by the earliest form of the Tarocco Piemontese. Until these problems, and those relating to the exact evolution of the 78-card pack in Florence, Rome and Sicily, have been resolved, there can be no assurance that we have successfully

reconstructed the history of Latin-suited Tarot cards. But the first progress towards such a reconstruction was made by Sylvia Mann, and it would have been improper to have ended this chapter without making clear that this was so.

Note on classical deities set

As stated on p. 409, there are now nineteen cards, of those found at the Castello Sforzesco with back designs of classical deities, in the Raccolta delle Stampe Achille Bertarelli. Novati, in his article in the *Bullettino dei civici musei*, gives the number found of this type as twenty-one; there is some discrepancy between the numbers cited by him of cards with particular back designs and those at present in the Raccolta. In detail, the numbers are as follows (the figures in brackets being those given by Novati): Iove – 4(7); Mercurio – 1(1); Proserpina – 4(2); Ercule – 1(3); Marte – 2(0); Pluto – 2(0); Venere – 1(1); Veritas – 3(3); Saturno – 1(1); Diana – 0(2); unidentified – 0(1). It will be seen that the discrepancies are not all in the same direction, which makes them very puzzling.